

THE EPISTLE OF
ST. PAUL TO THE
THESSALONIANS,
GALATIANS, ROMANS
VOLUME I

BENJAMIN JOWETT

1855

24

25

THE
EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL
TO THE
THESSALONIANS, GALATIANS,
ROMANS:

WITH CRITICAL NOTES AND DISSERTATIONS.



BY BENJAMIN JOWETT, M.A.

FELLOW AND TUTOR OF BALLIOL COLLEGE, OXFORD.

IN TWO VOLUMES.—VOL. I.

LONDON:
JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET.
1855.

LONDON:
A. and G. A. SPOTTISWOOD,
New-street-Square.

TO
THE REV. FREDERICK. TEMPLE, M.A.
FORMERLY FELLOW OF BALLIOL COLLEGE, OXFORD,

IN
GRATEFUL ACKNOWLEDGEMENT
OF NUMBERLESS THOUGHTS AND SUGGESTIONS,
AND OF
THE BLESSING OF A LONG AND NEVER FAILING FRIENDSHIP,

This Work
IS AFFECTIONATELY INSCRIBED.

INTRODUCTION.

No one who is acquainted with Sophocles or Thucydides in the volumes of Dindorf or Bekker, would be willing to reprint the text of those authors as it is to be found in editions of two centuries ago. No apology is therefore needed for laying aside the "Textus Receptus" of the New Testament.

The text of Lachmann, which has been adopted instead, has many claims to be considered as the most perfect that has hitherto appeared. It is the first, most consistent, and, with one exception, the only recension of the New Testament, drawn entirely from the earliest manuscripts and authorities. It is the work of a scholar of the highest genius, and of the greatest knowledge and experience as an editor. Any advance which can hereafter be made in the text of the New Testament is not likely to be as great as that by which Lachmann is separated from previous editors.

The merits of Lachmann's text would have been more generally acknowledged, had he distinctly stated the principles on which it was based. Like other great editors, he either could not, or would not, fully

explain his method of procedure. The peculiarities of his edition, so far as they can be gathered from his preface, are as follows:—

I. He aims at reproducing the text, not as it ought to be, but as it was: that is, not as it may be supposed to have come from the autograph of the writers themselves, but as it actually existed in copies of the fourth century.

II. The text which he seeks to restore is based (*a.*) on the most ancient Greek manuscripts.

(*β.*) On citations of Origen.

(*γ.*) On the most ancient Latin manuscripts, both of the Vulgate and of earlier versions. These, especially the versions older than the Vulgate, are considered as the representatives of an original Latin text, agreeing with that known to the translator of Irenæus and to Tertullian; and which before the time of Jerome had passed from Africa into Gaul and Italy; the stream of testimony thus parting into two heads — “*Vetus Afra, and Vetus Itala.*”

(*δ.*) On citations of the most ancient Latin Fathers; that is, the translators of Irenæus, Tertullian, Cyprian, Lucifer and Hilary.

Widely separated as these Fathers are by country, the latest of them is not divided from the earliest by a greater interval of time than two centuries. The same remark applies to the manuscript authorities also; within a short time they are spread over a wide space. The one class of testimonies falls between the second and the fourth century; the other (with scarcely an exception) between the fourth and the sixth; and the value of both is greatly increased by distance,

that is, by their combining the testimonies of different churches and countries.

Lachmann's text might be briefly described as the text of the most ancient and most independent authorities; the proof of independence being remoteness of origin or in other words, agreement or disagreement, of Eastern (that is, Alexandrian) and Western (that is, Italian or African) manuscripts. With the exception of a single manuscript of the Epistles of St. Paul, his Western authorities are exclusively Latin.

The principles which Lachmann applied to the selection of readings cannot be more briefly stated than in his own words. His summary of degrees of certainty is as follows: (1.) Nothing is better attested than that in which all authorities agree. (2.) The agreement is of less weight if part of the authorities are silent or defective. (3.) The combined evidence of witnesses brought together from different countries in favour of a reading is a stronger testimony than that of witnesses from some particular locality, either carelessly or designedly differing from one another. (4.) But the testimonies must be considered to be doubtfully balanced when witnesses from countries wide apart stand opposed to others equally distant in locality. (5.) Readings are uncertain which are uniformly the same in one country, and uniformly different in another. (6.) Readings are of slender authority as to which not even the same country presents a uniform testimony.

These rules are not equally observed by Lachmann in both editions. In the smaller one he pro-

fessed to follow the Eastern, that is, the Alexandrian authorities, wherever they agreed; and only where they disagreed to balance them by the consent of the West. Somewhat more weight is given to the latter element in the larger edition, which contains his more matured judgment; but the increased value is not such as to make any considerable difference in the selection of readings.

Lachmann, as has been already remarked, was the first who based the text on the most ancient authorities, solely on grounds of evidence, without regard to doctrinal considerations, or claims of authority, and irrespective even of the meaning of the words. The result has shown that the most ancient text is also in every other sense by far the best.

It is obvious that the principle of "the most ancient and widely diffused text" might be carried yet further by a comparison of the Oriental versions, which are either prior or represent a text which is prior to the fourth century. It would seem as if both they and the Latin versions, so far as they are regarded as containing the evidences of a more ancient text, must also be maintained as superior in authority to the Greek manuscripts themselves. Lachmann has not carried out his principle to this extent; probably because the materials are too slender, and the manner of using them too uncertain and difficult, to justify him in doing so.

The various readings of the third edition of Robert Stephens, 1550, are placed under the text; they will be found to agree very nearly with the *Textus Receptus* and the authorised English translation. The

latter is added on the opposite page with slight corrections ; which, where they are occasioned by variation of reading, are marked by numbers referring to the words of the original, which are retained underneath ; and by asterisks where they are the corrections of supposed mistranslations.

The author of this book is under great obligations to several German theologians, especially Usteri, F. Baur, Ewald, Neander, Winer, Tholuck, Olshausen, Fritsche, and in the essay on Philo, to Gfrörer. The plan of the work which excludes the mention of former commentators, renders it necessary that he should state explicitly the nature of these obligations. He is indebted to the writers named above for numberless references, for a great portion of his materials, and for several thoughts and observations ; which latter not having been taken directly from their works, he would find it impossible to separate from his own remarks, or to assign to their original owners.

He need hardly say that he is far from always agreeing with writers who differ so widely from one another as the distinguished persons whose names have been mentioned : he is not the less sensible of the debt which he owes them.

CONTENTS

OF

THE FIRST VOLUME.

THE FIRST EPISTLE TO THE THESSALONIANS.

	Page
Introduction - - - - -	3
Genuineness of the First Epistle - - - - -	15
Thessalonica - - - - -	27
Date and Place of Writing - - - - -	31
Subject of the Epistle - - - - -	34
CHAPTERS I.—IV. - - - - -	38
Evils in the Church of the Apostolical Age - - - - -	76
CHAP. V. - - - - -	86
On the Belief in the Coming of Christ in the Apostolical Age - - - - -	96
Passages in other Epistles of St. Paul illustrative of the Belief in the Coming of Christ - - - - -	105
On Paley's <i>Horæ Paulinæ</i> - - - - -	108

THE SECOND EPISTLE TO THE THESSALONIANS.

Introduction - - - - -	133
Genuineness of the Second Epistle - - - - -	136
Time and Place of the Second Epistle - - - - -	143
CHAPTERS I.—III. - - - - -	146
On the Man of Sin - - - - -	168

THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS.

Introduction - - - - -	185
Galatia - - - - -	190
Subject of the Epistle - - - - -	193

	Page
Genuineness of the Epistle - - - - -	198
Time and Place of the Epistle - - - - -	200
CHAPTERS I, II. - - - - -	204
On the Conversion of St. Paul - - - - -	222
CHAPS. III. IV. - - - - -	254
Fragment on the Character of St. Paul - - - - -	290
CHAPS. V. VI. - - - - -	304
St. Paul and the Twelve - - - - -	326
Paley on the Galatians - - - - -	349
On the Quotations from the Old Testament in the New - - - - -	353
St. Paul and Philo - - - - -	336

THE EPISTLES
TO
THE THESSALONIANS.

2 Cor. v. 16.

*ὥστε ἡμεῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν οὐδένα οἶδαμεν κατὰ σάρκα·
εἰ καὶ ἐγνώκαμεν κατὰ σάρκα χριστόν, ἀλλὰ νῦν οὐκέτι
γινώσκομεν.*

“Wherefore henceforth know we no man after the flesh: yea,
though we have known Christ according to the flesh, yet now hence-
forth know we him no more.”

THE

FIRST EPISTLE TO THE THESSALONIANS,

INTRODUCTION.

THE greater number of the Epistles of St. Paul may be arranged conveniently in two groups ; the first comprehending the Galatians, Corinthians, Romans ; the second, the Epistles of the Imprisonment, including under this term the Ephesians, Colossians, Philippians, and Philemon. At either end of the series, and at a distance from the rest, may be placed the two Epistles to the Thessalonians and the Pastorals, the first of which is shown by internal evidence to bear the earliest, while tradition and internal evidence alike assign to the latter the latest date in the list of St. Paul's writings.

Reading the Epistles in chronological order, many will be tempted to trace in them a gradual development of idea and doctrine. Others, again, will seek to impress upon them the same fixed type of truth held from the beginning, "the faith once delivered to the saints." Neither of these views is justified by an examination of the Epistles themselves. Both seem to lose sight of their practical aim, and of their fragmentary and occasional character. There is a growth in the Epistles of St. Paul, it is true ; but it is the growth of Christian life, not of intellectual progress,—the growth not of reflection, but of spiritual experience, enlarging as the world widens before the Apostle's eyes, passing from life to death, or from strife to peace, with the changes in the Apostle's own life, or the circumstances of his converts. There is a rest also in the Epistles of St. Paul, discernible not

in forms of thought or types of doctrine, but in the person of Christ himself, who is his centre in every Epistle, however various may be his modes of expression, or his treatment of controversial questions.

The difference, as well as the identity, are most clearly seen by the general comparison of the first with the second of the two above-mentioned groups of the Epistles. Such an one as Paul the aged, the prisoner of the Lord, regarding the strife of the world and of the Church from his cell at Cæsarea or Rome, is another man from the same Paul, when immersed in the strife itself, bearing the cross of Christ from place to place—in contests and trials every where, from the Jews,—from false brethren let in unawares,—from the fickleness of his own converts, ever “ready to affect others rather than himself,”—yea, and from those that “seemed to be pillars,” the Apostles at Jerusalem. No man leading two entirely different lives writes and expresses himself in precisely the same manner. There is one mode of expression we naturally adopt when near, another at a distance—one in the fulness and vigour of life, another in the near approach of death—one in joy, another in sorrow—one in sympathy with others, another when at variance with them. Change of sphere will often produce a corresponding change in the style and cast of our thoughts. What we have long or often meditated upon we express differently from what flashes upon us for the first time; what comes to us sealed by the experience of many years, assumes a different character in our minds from what with equal confidence we believed and acted upon in the fervour of first conviction.

Such is the kind of difference between the first and second of the two groups into which we have divided the Epistles of St. Paul. In the Epistles of the Imprisonment we have shifted the scene, and are arrived at a new stage in the Apostle's life, a stage in which he has, as it were, entered into rest, and can no more be ruffled by the current of human affairs. He seems to be no more striving for a principle, but to have established it, and to look back upon it;—the new relations of things, which are at first struggling into being, at length adjust themselves in a divine order, no longer as the elements of controversy, but as parts of the whole counsel of God. There is one body and one spirit, one Lord, one faith, one baptism. No mention is

made of extatic spiritual gifts, no further question arises of Jew and Gentile. Not only circumcision, but all other ordinances are ready to vanish away, Col. ii. 20. 23. On the other hand, as the Apostle is withdrawn from the field of his labours, the powers of good and evil seem idealised to him; he wrestles not "against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in the heavenly places," Eph. vi. 12. He enters more and more into communion with Christ, "in whom dwells all the fulness of the God-head bodily," Col. ii. 9.; "he fills up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ in his flesh, for the sake of the body of Christ, which is the Church," Col. i. 24. The conflict of the law no more stirs in him; the cloud of evil overshadows him no more; he is dead and risen with Christ, and translated into his kingdom, Col. i. 13., iii. 1. Earthly ties are transfigured before him into the likeness of Christ and his Church, Eph. v. 32. And the person of Christ himself seems to assume not a more intimate relation to the individual soul, but a more universal relation to mankind and to the world.

These and other points of contrast will readily occur to every student of the Epistles who has passed from the perusal of the Galatians, Corinthians, and Romans, to that of the Ephesians and Colossians, or, in a less degree, of the Philipians. We have now to touch upon the still wider difference which separates the Epistle to the Thessalonians from either of the above-mentioned divisions, and which, from the very absence of links of connexion between them, it is more difficult to realise. It is but a short interval of time which can be allowed—not more than three or four years at the utmost—between the date of the Epistle to the Thessalonians, written probably from Athens or Corinth, and the Epistle to the Galatians, written during the Apostle's sojourn at Ephesus or in its neighbourhood. And yet in this short interval how great a change has grown up, not merely in the style and manner of the Apostle, but even in his subject! How many topics occur in the one Epistle which are wanting in the other! The style of the Epistle to the Galatians is fervid and impassioned, and it abounds in allusions to the Old Testament; it has the tone of one speaking

with authority. The Epistles to the Thessalonians are perhaps the least impassioned, and most regular in style, of any of St. Paul's Epistles: they, contain no quotation from the Old Testament, and with the single exception of one passage in the Second Epistle, they seem to remit the authority which they might justly claim.

Nor is there a less difference in the subject than in the mode of treating it. There is no mention in the Thessalonians of the great question of circumcision and uncircumcision — of faith and works — of the relation of Jew and Gentile — of union with the mystical body of Christ — of death unto life — of the mystery of past ages, that had been now revealed. All that we are accustomed to regard as peculiarly characteristic of the Apostle, the great themes of his other Epistles, are wanting here. Instead of them, we find him dwelling on the immediate coming of Christ, with whom "we that are alive" are to meet in the air, in a manner unlike his allusions in other places, either to a future life, or to the union of the believer with Christ. Not once but many times does he return to the same subject, of which he had spoken to them while he was yet with them, 2 Thess. ii. 5.; and this not merely in general outline, but in detail, for he had told them of the coming of Antichrist and of "that which let." It was the leading thought of his mind at that time. The gospel which he preached in both Epistles, might be described, not as the Gospel of the Cross of Christ, but of the Coming of Christ.

It would be hard indeed to suppose that St. Paul, when he wrote the Epistles to the Thessalonians, could have felt and thought exactly as the same St. Paul in writing the Epistles to the Romans or the Galatians, or to maintain that in the former case he purposely reserved and held back what in the latter he was commissioned to reveal. More naturally we should imagine that the Epistle to the Thessalonians was separated from the Epistles which immediately followed it by a difference, greater in degree, but the same in kind with that which separated the Epistles to the Romans, Galatians, and Corinthians from the Epistles of the Imprisonment. We should naturally argue, that the same Apostle, the style of whose letters so strikingly corresponded to the circumstances of his life, may have yet gone through further changes which may account for the greater

difference; that he who constantly received visions and revelations of the Lord, who spake with tongues more than they all, could hardly have remained stationary in his view of Christian truth; that one whose life was spent in conflict with his own nation must in the course of that conflict more and more have laid aside the garb of Judaism, "the weak and beggarly elements" of the law. We should observe, as worthy of note, that the greater part of the interval between the composition of the Galatians and the Thessalonians was spent by the Apostle in three of the most cultivated cities of the world, Athens, Corinth, and Ephesus. And we should infer that in the short period of three or four years, surrounded as the Apostle was by so many influences, pouring himself out daily in prayer and exhortation to all the Churches, perhaps coming in contact more nearly than before with the Alexandrian learning, such a change might very well have taken place as divides the Thessalonians from the later Epistles.

That some such change did take place in the Apostle himself is not a mere *à priori* theory based upon the common nature of the human mind, nor is it merely an *à posteriori* result derived from the examination of the Epistles when arranged in chronological order. It is implied further in a passage of the Apostle's own writings: "Yea, and if I have known Christ according to the flesh, henceforth I will know him no more," 2 Cor. v. 16. It is impossible to suppose that in this passage the Apostle is speaking of the time before his conversion. His state then could not have been described in so gentle a manner, nor could the term "knowing Christ according to the flesh" have been applied with any propriety to Paul the persecutor of the Church, nor would such an allusion have had any meaning to the disciples of Corinth, nor will the connexion allow us to suppose that he is speaking in his own person of Christians generally. It is the obvious intention of the Apostle to speak of himself, not of them, and not of what happened in those days when "he persecuted the Church ignorantly through unbelief;" but of his manner of preaching among those very Corinthians to whom the Epistle is addressed. There was a Judaizing party at Corinth who maintained that in a special sense they were the disciples of Christ, and of whom elsewhere the Apostle says that he is as much Christ's as they are, 2 Cor. x. 7. He had been

led beyond them, or they had gone back from him; and he was conscious of the chasm which separated him from them. It seemed to him an increasing chasm; he was aware of a time when he had more nearly approximated to their Judaising tenets, or, in other words, had known Christ according to the flesh. That time must have been when he was known to them, when he was last at Corinth; that is to say, the very time when he was probably writing the Epistle to the Thessalonians.

But what was the nature of this change in the Apostle's preaching? How did "Christ according to the flesh" differ from that Christ which the Apostle at that very time was seeking to infuse into the hearts of his converts? Could there have been a time when he preached a Christ of the Jews only, and not also of the Gentiles? Such a supposition is contradictory to all that is told us of the Apostle in the Acts, and to all that he tells us of himself in the Epistles. From the first moment of his conversion he was the Apostle of the Gentiles. He could never have taught that Christ was the Christ of the Jews only, or that without circumcision there was no entering into covenant with God. However naturally such a meaning may be assigned to the words "Christ according to the flesh," it is so inconsistent with the whole tenor of the Apostle's life as to compel us to adopt a different interpretation.

The remarkable expression in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians is not absolutely isolated, but derives confirmation from other places in the writings of the Apostle. About four years later, in writing to the Galatians he says (v. 2.): "And I, brethren, if I yet preach circumcision, why do I yet suffer persecution? then is the offence of the Cross ceased." These words can have no other meaning than that St. Paul had once preached what his opponents declared to be the doctrine of the circumcision. That he was conscious also of a certain progress in his life, "forgetting those things that are behind, and reaching forth to those things that are before," is also manifest from such passages as Phil. iii. 13., Eph. iv. 13, 14. That there was a difference in his mode of preaching to the Jew and to the Gentile—to the weak and to the strong—he himself asserts, where he says, "To the Jews became I as a Jew;" and, "I, brethren, could not

speak unto you as unto spiritual, but as unto carnal, as unto babes in Christ." Compare 1 Cor. ii., Heb. vi. 1—3. It is remarkable also, that long afterwards, in writing to the Philippians he should have described this very time, the time, that is, of his writing the Epistle to the Thessalonians, though more than fourteen years after his conversion as the beginning of the Gospel, iv. 3.

All these passages have some connexion, more or less near, with the expression which we are considering, "If I have known Christ according to the flesh;" they do not, however, enable us distinctly to determine its meaning. We could not indeed expect that the Apostle should allude more clearly to a change which was half concealed from himself, and which it was needless for him to detail to his converts. The allusions, though obscure, are real, but they throw us back again on the connexion of the words in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians itself, for their interpretation. Now it is observable that, in the original passage, the Apostle is not speaking of the admission of the Gentiles, or of the universality of the Gospel, but of "death with Christ." "We thus judge, that if one died for all then all died; and that he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them and rose again. Wherefore henceforth know we no man after the flesh: yea, though we have known Christ after the flesh, henceforth we know him no more." And the rest of the chapter speaks of "the absence from the body which is presence with the Lord," "of the house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens" (v. 1—8.), "of Christ becoming sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." v. 21.

To this is opposed the knowledge of Christ according to the flesh, which cannot consist with the inward witness of such things, which in modern language might be described as unmystical, unspiritual, different from that communion of his life and death which is the leading principle of the Apostle in his later teaching. In general terms it may be explained as the knowledge of Christ, in a more Jewish and less Christian manner, from without rather than from within,—a knowledge of him, the very antithesis of that which St. Paul speaks of in his later Epistles, as "the life hidden with Christ in

God;" such as St. Paul had himself had in "the beginning of the Gospel;" such as he imparted to his converts, "when he was not able to speak unto them as unto spiritual but as fleshly, as babes in Christ," 1 Cor. iii. 1. More than this, the connexion of the words will not justify us in assuming. But here the Epistle to the Thessalonians comes in to supply the deficiency. For if we find allusions in the Epistles to the Corinthians to a change in the Apostle's teaching; if, further, a similar change is traceable in his extant writings; and if the probable times of both correspond, it can hardly be thought fanciful or far-fetched to bring one into connexion with the other.

That such a change is capable of being traced has been already intimated. Both Epistles to the Thessalonians, with the exception of the personal narrative and of a few practical precepts, are the expansion and repetition of a single thought—"the coming of Christ." It was the absorbing thought of the Apostle and his converts, quickened in both by the persecutions which they had suffered. Not that with this expectation of Christ's kingdom there mingled any vision of a temporal rule over the kingdoms of the earth. That was far from the Apostle. But there was that in it which fell short of the more perfect truth. It was not "the kingdom of God is within you;" but "lo here, and lo there." It was defined by time, and was to take place within the Apostle's own life. The images in which it clothed itself were traditional among the Jews; they were outward and visible, liable to the misconstruction of the enemies of the faith, and to the misapprehension of the first converts, imperfectly, as the Apostle saw afterwards, conveying the inward and spiritual meaning. The kingdom which they described was not eternal and heavenly, but very near and present, ready to burst forth everywhere, and by its very nearness in point of time seeming to touch our actual human state. Afterwards the kingdom of God appeared to remove itself within, to withdraw into the unseen world. The earthen vessel must be broken first, the believer unclothed that he might be clothed upon, that mortality may be swallowed up of life. He was no longer "waiting for the Son from heaven"; but "desirous to depart and be with Christ," Phil. i. 23. Such is the change, not so much in the Apostle's belief as in his mode of conception; a change natural to the human mind

itself, and above all to the Jewish mind; a change which, after it had taken place, left the vestiges of the prior state in the Montanism of the second century, which may not improperly be regarded as the spirit of the first century overliving itself. Old things had passed away, and behold, all things became new. And yet the former things—the material vision of Christ's kingdom—have ever been prone to return; not only in the first and second century, but in every age of enthusiasm men have been apt to walk by sight and not by faith. In the hour of trouble and perplexity, when darkness spreads itself over the earth, and Antichrist is already come, they have lifted up their eyes to the heavens, looking for the sign of the Son of Man.

We do not pretend precisely to draw the line between the earlier and later teaching of the Apostle. Some elements of the earlier mode of thought may be traced in the later Epistles, but as it were ready to vanish away, and attaching themselves less to the substance and more to the form of the Apostle's writings. When the things spoken of are such "as eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, nor hath it entered into the heart of man to conceive," it would be an error to dwell too much on the manner in which they are presented to us. Nor is it meant entirely to describe the nature of the Apostle's preaching according to the flesh, or to determine how much of it may have been based upon popular or traditional beliefs of the Jews, or what it had in common with the Montanism of the second century. The only sources from which it is possible to gather an answer to questions like these, are the Epistles to the Thessalonians themselves, the difference of which from the later Epistles is too plain to be mistaken. Whether the passage in the Corinthians be connected with them or not, that difference remains the same. However little we know about it, the change which we have been describing is not imaginary but real.

Nor must it be lost sight of, that in the difference between the First and Second Epistles themselves, we find a link of transition between the Thessalonians and the later writings of the Apostle. The Second Epistle, it is true, is not more mystical and spiritual in its character than the First; it speaks of a future judgment under the same outward imagery. But it defers its advent: the course of this world is to go on for a time; the daily occupations of life are to be pursued; the day

of the Lord is not at hand in any such sense that sudden confusion should arise. It is in this respect that it agrees with the later writings of St. Paul, viz., in withdrawing the mind from an expectation of an immediate as well as outward coming of the Lord Jesus.

That our Lord should have been called King of the Jews, that the early expectation of the disciples should have been the restoration of the kingdom to Israel, that St. Paul should in his two first journeys have been carried before Roman governors as an enemy to Cæsar, that he and his fellow teachers should be designated as "they that turned the world upside down," affords a general confirmation of the view proposed in these remarks. True it is, that accusations may be utterly false, but more generally they have a colour of truth; there is something which, though in one sense false, supplies groundwork and support to the accusation. It is hardly likely, for example, at Thessalonica itself, that the Jews would have said, "These all do contrary to the decrees of Cæsar, saying that there is another king, one Jesus," had the Apostle spoken only of a kingdom not of this world. It is remarkable, that on his third journey the persecution of the Roman governors has wholly ceased. Neither at the places which he then visited nor on his trial at Jerusalem is any suspicion urged of his teaching contrary to Cæsar.

Not to weary the reader with pursuing the subject of this digression into conjectures, we shall briefly sum up the inferences which have been drawn:—

1. That the difference between the earlier and later preaching of St. Paul was analogous to the difference which separated him from the Apostles of the circumcision, though not absolutely the same with it, as, from the first, St. Paul was set apart as the Apostle of the Gentiles. As they were the Apostles of the circumcision to the circumcision, so he might in this earlier part of his course have been described in his own words as the Apostle of the circumcision to the uncircumcised, the Jew to Gentiles.

2. That though the period of St. Paul's life here referred to is almost wholly unknown to us, it is expressly indicated by himself, in the 2 Cor. v. 16., and may be fairly gathered from Gal. v. 11., that

there was such a period when he knew Christ according to the flesh, and might be thought to be a preacher of the circumcision.

3. That the time and character of his early preaching described in these words agrees with the date and subject of the Epistle to the Thessalonians; and that there is a peculiarity about the Epistles to the Thessalonians, which remains to be accounted for, whether brought into connexion or not with the above-quoted passages.

Supposing then that there was a time when the Apostle had preached Christ according to the flesh, that is, more in a Jewish and less in a spiritual manner, and that no longer back than on his last visit to the Corinthian Church, and a new light at once breaks on the Epistles to the Thessalonians. The difference of subject which distinguishes them from the other Epistles of St. Paul is natural, and what we should expect. They are full of practical precepts, and in this respect remind us of the Epistle to St. James; other portions of them approach more nearly than any other part of the New Testament to the book of Revelation, the first vision of the Church descending from heaven to earth, the image of the hope and faith of the earliest believers. They breathe the spirit of the earlier chapters of the Acts of the Apostles, in which the Apostles of Jerusalem are described as waiting for their Lord, watching the signs of those things that were coming to pass upon the earth. They say nothing of justification by faith and not by the works of the law, or of the mystical union with Christ or of the Church which is his body; but no more does the earliest narrative of the primitive Church, or the Epistle of St. James, or the book of Revelation. They exhibit the Revelation of Christ in an external form, "descending from heaven with a shout," "in flaming fire taking vengeance," also as present and immediate; for we which are alive shall be caught up to meet the Lord in the air; such figures recall to us the prophecies of Daniel. Lastly, they set before us the likeness of a Gospel, simple, moral, practical, — looking to Christ as its author and finisher, but not yet entering into the deepest recesses of the human soul, nor in open antagonism with the law, nor reading the Old Testament as the allegory of the New.

All this is unlike the other Epistles of St. Paul, and has therefore

been made a ground for doubting the genuineness of the Epistles to the Thessalonians. According to the view here taken, the very difference from the other Epistles tends rather to establish their genuineness, because it is a difference of that kind which we should expect in St. Paul's early preaching as described by himself in the expression, "If I have known Christ according to the flesh, henceforth I know him no more." It is a difference that he himself indicates as it were by chance in another of his Epistles, and the earlier lesson as well as the later has been preserved to us.

Biblical criticism is, from the very nature of its subject matter, peculiarly liable to the error of stating as a certainty that which is no more than a probable conjecture. The scantiness of our materials in the present instance is sufficient to warn us against too great a confidence in any hypothesis whatever. It would be equally erroneous to maintain the absolute certainty of the connexion which has been suggested, as to object to the attempt to trace such a connexion on grounds of doctrine. Whether the conjecture offered be sound or otherwise (and the peculiarity, it may once more be observed, of the Epistles to the Thessalonians as well as the meaning of 2 Cor. v. 16. are quite independent of it), it cannot be refuted on grounds of doctrine. Objections of this kind lie without the range of an historical inquiry. That St. Paul saw the truth more clearly at one period of his life than another, is simply a statement of his own. It is a fact of the same nature as his greater enlightenment than the Apostles at Jerusalem, or the preparation of John the Baptist for Christ's coming, or the relation of the Old Testament to the New. As in the world, so in the individual, we witness the formation of the Gospel, the preparations for it, the anticipations of it. To deny differences of thought and character in different persons, or in the same person at different times, or to deny the still greater differences of ages and states of society, renders the Scripture unmeaning, and, by depriving us of all rule of interpretation, enables us to substitute for its historical and grammatical sense any other that we please.

GENUINENESS OF THE FIRST EPISTLE.

THE First Epistle to the Thessalonians is not deficient in external evidence for its genuineness. It is quoted by Irenæus, Clement, and Tertullian; is named in the Muratori fragment; and had a place among the ten Pauline Epistles, which were admitted into the Canon of Marcion, by whom it was ranked fifth in the list of St. Paul's writings. Like all the other books of the New Testament, it is said to have been corrupted by him, or rather, if Epiphanius may be trusted (*Hereses*, p. 371.), he left nothing of the original. The question of the relation of Marcion to the canon of Scripture is obscure, and one which, as we have no means of determining it from the Epistle to the Thessalonians, it would be out of place to discuss here. The fact, however, that he inserted the Epistle in his canon, is a proof that a writing under this name, identified by quotations of Irenæus, Clement, and Tertullian, as the one which we possess, must have been received as a genuine work of St. Paul, at least as early as the middle of the second century.

It is not in consequence of any deficiency of external, but, as is supposed, of internal evidence, that doubts have been raised of late years respecting the genuineness of the Epistle. In some respects it has been thought too like, in others too unlike, undoubted writings of the Apostle, for us to maintain that it is from his hand. The critic by whom these difficulties have been chiefly urged, is Dr. Baur, of Tübingen, whose objections may be regarded as a summary of all that can be said on that side of the argument.* They may be conveniently arranged under the following heads:—

- i. Absence of individuality, and of doctrinal statements.

* Baur, *Paulus*, p. 480—492.

- ii. The tone of a later age discernible in ii. 14—16.
- iii. Inconsistency with the Acts of the Apostles, in relation to some points of fact.
- iv. Perpetual reference to the events recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, indicative of the sources whence the Epistle was compiled.
- v. Verbal similarities to passages in the other Epistles of St. Paul, leading to a suspicion of designed imitation.
- vi. Discrepancies from the other Epistles in modes of thought, especially traceable in iv. 13—18.

i. Absence of individuality (*eigenthumlichkeit*) and of doctrinal statements. "It is made up of nothing but wishes, instructions, admonitions—contains no doctrinal subject matter at all, with the single exception of the mention of the coming of Christ, iv. 13—18."

There is a difficulty in meeting such objections as these, because, whatever real weight they may have, they ultimately resolve themselves into the impression of an individual critic. Sometimes they come to us with overwhelming force; at other times we wonder that we can have been influenced by them at all. They presuppose that we know beforehand how an author *ought* to have written, or that a meagre induction gathered from two or three short writings is a sufficient criterion of how he must have written every where, and at all times. Like all other objections they labour under the fallacy of presenting one side of the question only. Grounds of suspicion are endless; and in answer we can only accumulate the probabilities opposed to them. On the same ground with Baur, it may be argued with great truth, that the very absence of individuality agrees with the incidental character of the Epistles. Why should we expect them all to bear marks of "originality"? Might not the Apostle write as a man writes to his friends, without seeking to impart any new truth? Does not the First Epistle to the Thessalonians arise naturally from a real occasion—the return of Timothy with news respecting the converts—an occasion just similar to that of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians? And is not the disproportion as great as

possible between the doctrinal and practical sections of the other Epistles?

Slight as these presumptions are, they may be fairly placed in the scale against an argument such as Baur's. If it were admitted that the absence of doctrinal ideas makes the Epistle unworthy of St. Paul, it makes it also a forgery without an object.

ii. The tone of a later age discernible in chap. ii. 16.: "For the wrath is come upon them to the uttermost;" which is supposed to be an after-reflection on the destruction of Jerusalem.

To the Apostle, reading the future in the present, the state of Judea at any time during the last thirty years before the destruction of the city, would have been sufficient to justify the expression, "wrath is come upon them to the uttermost." The fearful looking for of judgment was natural, not only to Christians, but to Jews themselves to Josephus as well as to St. Paul. The passage must not, however, be strained beyond its natural meaning. The word *ὀργή*, wrath, in other places (Rom. i. 18.) refers at least as much to final impenitence and hardness of heart, "the spiritual wrath of God," as to temporal judgments. And the connexion in which it occurs here "forbidding us to speak to the Gentiles, that they might be saved to fill up their sins alway," shows the Apostle to be speaking, not of punishment, but of reprobation.

iii. Inconsistencies with the Acts of the Apostles in some points of fact. Two of them are: (1.) The statement of the Acts that Silas and Timotheus, after being left behind at Berea, came up with the Apostle at Corinth, after he had left them (Acts, xviii. 5.), compared with the fact recorded in the Epistle that Timothy was sent back from Athens to Thessalonica, 1 Thess. iii. 1; and (2.) The impression conveyed by the Acts, vii. 4. that the Thessalonian Church was of Jewish origin, compared with the impression conveyed by 1 Thess. ii. 14. that it was Gentile.

What reconciliation of these opposite views is possible will be considered in a note on Paley's *Horæ Paulinæ*. It is sufficient here to observe, that the discrepancies alluded to, are not greater than those

between the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistle to the Galatians, in the account of the council. If these latter discrepancies have never led any critic to doubt the Epistle to the Galatians, neither is there any reason why similar discrepancies should be assumed as fatal to the Epistle to the Thessalonians.

Another objection is based on the indications afforded by the Epistle, that the Church to which it is addressed had been already long established. Their faith is known in every place, i. 9. ; they had a regular Church government, v. 12. ; and some of their members had died since the Apostle's visit to them, iv. 13., although but a few weeks, or at the most a few months, could have elapsed since. Compare Acts, xvii. 1—8., xviii. 1—5.

The answer to this objection is to be sought, in the peculiar circumstances of the early Church, in which a year might be said to be like a day, and a whole life to be crowded into the moment of conversion. Men living in expectation of the coming of the Lord lost their measure of time ; every hour was fraught to them with feelings and events. Nor must the language of the Apostle himself be too strictly interpreted when speaking of the Church, as seen by the eye of faith and love idealised before him. Compare 1 Cor. i. 9. especially as contrasted with the after tone of the Epistle, Rom. i. 8. Further it may be observed, that some kind of organisation was established by St. Paul, immediately on his first declaration of the Gospel everywhere among the new converts, Acts, xiv. 23. ; and that nothing is implied in the word *προϊστάμενοι* but what must have existed in the Jewish Synagogue, and would naturally spring up in the Christian Church. The death of even one or two members of the Church might be sufficient to suggest the inquiry, what became of the departed.

iv. Reference to the events recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, indicative of the sources whence the Epistle was compiled.

Baur supposes the forger of the Epistle to have had before him, either the Acts of the Apostles themselves, or earlier documents from which the Acts of the Apostles were compiled. The Epistle appears to him to add nothing to the events narrated there.

Opposite probabilities are : (1.) The natural manner in which the

events referred to are introduced. To go back to what happened while he was yet with them, is quite in character with the writings of the Apostle. In 1 Thessalonians, as in the Galatians, he recalls his converts to the moment of their first conversion, he appeals, as in the Corinthians, to the witness of his own life, and awakens their sympathies by the mention of persecutions which he suffered for their sakes. There is scarcely one of his Epistles which has not several allusions of this kind. Hence there is no sort of improbability that many such might occur in the Thessalonians. But, on the other hand, it must be observed, (2.) That these resemblances to the Acts relate only to the persecution which the Apostle had endured at Philippi (ii. 2.), to the persecution of the Thessalonian Church (ii. 14.), and to his own stay at Athens; and, (3.) That the discrepancies just noticed are of themselves opposite probabilities. For is it likely that a forger, carefully reading the Acts of the Apostles when compiling his Epistle, could have committed so clumsy an error as to send back Timothy and Silas, not from Corinth, but from Athens? or would he have lighted upon so crude an invention as to send back Timothy at all, to satisfy the longing desire of the Apostle about his converts, when Timothy had just come from the place to which he was sent? Or again, is it probable that he would have fallen into the inconsistency of representing that a Gentile which the Acts rather intimates to have been a Jewish Church? Or, that persecution as raised by Gentiles, which the Acts informs us originated with Jews? The greatest carelessness must be attributed to him, to account for such oversights. But the greatest ingenuity would have been required to imitate the style and topics of St. Paul, as he must be supposed to have done. It is a refinement not to be thought of, that he purposely differed from the Acts of the Apostles, with the view of concealing the sources from which his information was derived.

v. The next argument of Baur is of a more subtle kind, and can only be justly appreciated by a careful comparison of the passages on which it is based. He thinks that in 1 Thessalonians he can trace a repetition of the same thoughts that occur elsewhere in the writings of St. Paul; or in other words, he supposes the Epistle to be a sort of cento ingeniously made up from other places.

The instances given by him are as follows:—

1 Thess. i. 5.

τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἡμῶν οὐκ ἐγενήθη
πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐν λόγῳ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ
ἐν δυνάμει, καὶ ἐν Πνεύματι ἁγίῳ
καὶ ἐν πληροφορίᾳ πολλῇ.

i. 6.

καὶ ὑμεῖς μιμηταὶ ἡμῶν ἐγενή-
θητε καὶ τοῦ κυρίου, δεξάμενοι τὸν
λόγον ἐν ᾗ ψεῖ πολλῇ.

i. 8.

ἀφ' ὑμῶν γὰρ ἐξήχεται ὁ λόγος
τοῦ κυρίου οὐ μόνον ἐν τῇ Μακε-
δονίᾳ καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἀχαΐᾳ, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν
παντὶ τόπῳ ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν ἢ πρὸς
τὸν Θεὸν ἐξελέλυθεν, ὥστε μὴ χρειαν
ἔχειν ἡμᾶς λαλεῖν τι.

ii. 4—10.

⁴ ἀλλὰ καθὼς δεδοκιμάσμεθα
ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ πιστευθῆναι τὸ εὐαγ-
γέλιον, οὕτως λαλοῦμεν, οὐχ ὡς
ἀνθρώποις ἀρέσκοντες, ἀλλὰ [τῷ]
Θεῷ τῷ δοκιμάζοντι τὰς καρδίας
ἡμῶν. ⁵ οὐτε γάρ ποτε ἐν λόγῳ κολα-
κείας ἐγενήθημεν, καθὼς οἴδατε οὐτε
ἐν προφάσει πλεονεξίας (Θεὸς μάρ-
τυς), ⁶ οὐτε ζητοῦντες ἐξ ἀνθρώ-
πων δόξαν, οὐτε ἀφ' ὑμῶν οὐτε ἀπ'
ἄλλων, δυνάμενοι ἐν βάρει εἶναι
ὡς χριστοῦ ἀπόστολοι, ⁷ ἀλλ'
ἐγενήθημεν νήπιοι ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν,
ὡς εἰς τροφὸς θάλπη τὰ ἑαυτῆς
τέκνα, ⁸ οὕτως ὁμιροῦμενοι ὑμῶν,
ἐνδοκοῦμεν μεταδοῦναι ὑμῖν οὐ μό-
νον τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀλλὰ
καὶ τὰς ἑαυτῶν ψυχάς, διότι ἀγαπη-

1 Cor. ii. 4.

καὶ ὁ λόγος μου καὶ τὸ κήρυγμά
μου οὐκ ἐν πειθοῖς σοφίας λόγοις,
ἀλλὰ ἐν ἀποδείξει πνεύματος καὶ
δυνάμεως.

xi. 1.

μιμηταὶ μου γίνεσθε, καθὼς καὶ γὰρ
χριστοῦ.

Rom. i. 8.

ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν καταγγέλλεται ἐν
ὅλῳ τῷ κόσμῳ.

1 Cor. ii. 4.—see above.

1 Cor. iv. 3—4.

ἐμοὶ δὲ εἰς ἐλάχιστόν ἐστιν ἵνα
ὕψ' ὑμῶν ἀνακριθῶ ἢ ὑπὸ ἀνθρωπί-
νης ἡμέρας· ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἑμᾶντὸν ἀνα-
κρίνω (οὐδὲν γὰρ ἑμᾶντῳ σύννομα,
ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐν τούτῳ δεδικαίωμαι), ὁ
δὲ ἀνακρίνων με κύριός ἐστιν.

ix. 15.

ἐγὼ δὲ οὐ κέχρημαι οὐδενὶ τού-
των. οὐκ ἔγραψα δὲ ταῦτα, ἵνα οὕτως
γένηται ἐν ἐμοί· καλὸν γάρ μοι
μᾶλλον ἀποθανεῖν, ἢ τὸ καύχημά
μου· οὐδεὶς κενώσει.

2 Cor. ii. 17.

οὐ γὰρ ἔσμεν ὡς οἱ πολλοὶ καπη-

1 Thess. ii. 4—10.

τοὶ ἡμῖν ἐγενήθητε. ⁹ μνημονεύετε γάρ, ἀδελφοί, τὸν κόπον ἡμῶν καὶ τὸν μόχθον· νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας ἐργαζόμενοι πρὸς τὸ μὴ ἐπιβαρῆσαι τινα ὑμῶν ἐκηρύξαμεν εἰς ὑμᾶς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Θεοῦ. ¹⁰ ὑμεῖς μάρτυρες καὶ ὁ Θεός, ὡς ὁσίως καὶ δικαίως καὶ ἀμέμπτως ὑμῖν τοῖς πιστεύουσιν ἐγενήθημεν.

2 Cor. ii. 17.

λεύοντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐξ εἰλικρινείας, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐκ Θεοῦ κατενέναντι Θεοῦ ἐν χριστῷ λαλοῦμεν.

v. 11.

Εἰδότες οὖν τὸν φόβον τοῦ κυρίου, ἀνθρώπους πείθομεν, Θεῷ δὲ πεφανερώμεθα· ἐλπίζω δὲ καὶ ἐν ταῖς συνειδήσεσιν ὑμῶν πεφανερῶσθαι.

xi. 9.

καὶ ἐν παντὶ ἀβαρῆ ἐμᾶντὸν ὑμῖν ἐτήρησα καὶ τηρήσω.

That these are striking similarities is not to be doubted. The whole question turns upon the point, Of what nature is the similarity?

There is one kind of resemblance between two passages which indicates that one of them is a repetition of the other, while another kind proves them only to have been the production of the same mind. Even exact verbal agreements do not necessarily show more than that the same words have been used twice over by the same person. St. Paul, when writing nearly at the same time to the Ephesians and Colossians, might to both Churches repeat the same topics expressed in the same words, without this repetition necessarily shaking the genuineness of either Epistle. On the other hand, the portion of the Second Epistle of St. Peter and of the Epistle of St. Jude which is common to both is such as to demand a different explanation.

The general question, whether the constant recurrence of the same thoughts or topics in different writings be a presumption against their genuineness, or not, is simply to be determined by what we know of the author himself.

Is it in accordance with his style to repeat himself? If we were able to say no, a strong presumption would be raised against the genuineness of a work which seemed to be but a repetition of his other writings. But if he were in the habit of repeating himself,

the very repetitions would be rather a proof than a disproof of the genuineness of the work in which they occurred. In like manner, similar turns of expression would not be found recurring with great masters of language, in the same way as with writers whose style was constrained and vocabulary limited.

Now, it must be observed: (1.) That the parallel which we have quoted in no instance extends to whole verses, like that of St. Jude and St. Peter; (2.) That they occur in a writer who, in his undoubtedly genuine Epistles, is remarkable for such repetitions. Not to mention the parallelism of the Ephesians and the Colossians, the very passages, which we have already quoted from the two Epistles to the Corinthians, closely resemble similar expressions in the Epistles to the Galatians and Romans. Compare 1 Cor. ii. 4., iv. 3. 4. with Gal. i. 10.; or 2 Cor. xii. 7. with Gal. iv. 14.; or Rom. xiv. with 1 Cor. viii.; or the deferred intention in 2 Cor. xiii. 1. with Rom. i. 13.; or the unwillingness to enter on another man's labours in Romans xv. 18—24. with 2 Cor. x. 14—16.; or Gal. iii. 6—12. with Rom. iv. 3—11. Almost every Epistle of St. Paul has a network of thoughts and expressions derived from the rest. And hence we infer that the passages in the Thessalonians quoted by Baur are rather to be regarded as an indication of the genuineness than of the spuriousness of the Epistle; because they are quoted in the very manner in which St. Paul repeats himself; and, (3.) They are not of a kind which a forger could easily have invented.

It might be truly said of the early Ecclesiastical forgeries that nothing could exceed the readiness with which they were received; but on the other hand, nothing could exceed the clumsiness of their falsification. They made no attempt to imitate the style of the author whose name they bore; they commonly carried on their face the object with which they were written. A forgery so ingenious as the First Epistle to the Thessalonians, containing so many latent resemblances to the genuine writings of the Apostle, would be unique in Ecclesiastical literature.

Paley remarks, that a writer of the second century would never have thought of attributing to St. Paul the expectation of the immediate end of the world, which had already been refuted by the course

of events. Put in a slightly different point of view, the argument is perfectly just. He who may be supposed to have written the First Epistle to the Thessalonians in the second century, was probably a believer in the immediate advent of Christ. But whatever may have been his own belief, he would have felt the anachronism of putting into the mouth of one long since dead, words that implied that he would be alive when it took place. And the whole spirit of such a belief would have led him to have supported it by present immediate inspiration rather than by the testimony of an Apostle who had himself fallen asleep.

Lastly. Many positive evidences may be urged in favour of the genuineness of the First Epistle to the Thessalonians. Among these we reckon the last of Baur's objections,

vi. The discrepancy in subject and modes of thought from the other Epistles, as accounted for in the preceding essay. Without laying greater stress on this argument than it deserves, we pass on to enumerate other internal evidences that the Epistle is St. Paul's. Such are :—

(1.) The desire to see the face of his converts iii. 6. 10., and delayed intention to come to them, ii. 18. Compare Rom. i. 13.; 1 Cor. xvi. 1.; 2 Cor. i. 16., xiii. 1.; Phil. i. 8.; Philem. 22.

(2.) The lively sympathy with them throughout the Epistle. Such passages as ii. 17., iii. 5. 10., are good instances of this. He is taken from them in presence, not in heart; he lives if they stand fast in the Lord; they desire to see him, even as he them. These expressions show the same sort of reciprocity between the Apostle and his converts as is traceable in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians. In both there is the same sensitiveness to every human as well as spiritual consolation, the same loneliness when separated from them, and the same joy at the good news of Titus and Timothy. Compare 1 Thess. ii. 17, iii. 6. with 2 Cor. vii. 5. 7., ii. 12. 13.; also Phil. iii. 25. 29.; Col. i. 7. 8. Yet great as is the similarity of thought, there is no similarity of language, such as that into which an imitator would naturally have fallen.

(3.) The frequent and characteristic mention of himself. As in the Galatians he perpetually recurs to the time when he was yet with

them. It is through himself in the remembrance of himself that he would implant in them the image of Christ. And yet that which he especially seeks to recall, is the very absence of any claim or pretension on his part. He did not seek praise when he might have done so; he did not receive the maintenance to which, as an Apostle, he had a right. 2 Cor. xi. 9., xiii. 13. 14. Does not this remind us of him who did glory and did not glory, seeming, as it were, to assert and deny himself at once? And yet the favourite word *καυχᾶσθαι* no where occurs in the First Epistle to the Thessalonians.

(4.) The delicate manner in which reproof and admonition are conveyed as what they already knew and practised, and had no need that the Apostle should teach them, iv. 9., v. 2.

(5.) The germs of thoughts and of precepts which may be traced in a more developed form in later Epistles (compare remarks at p. 3.). Thus the practical exhortations at the end of the Epistle, are more fully worked out in the twelfth chapter of the Romans; the figure in v. 8. is expanded in Eph. vi. 13—17. A slighter example of the same growth is traceable in the expression “Whether we wake or sleep we may live together with him,” in v. 10. compared with the common phraseology of the Romans, Galatians, and the later Epistles. Another is the reference to the heathen origin of the Thessalonians, in i. 9.; compare 1 Cor. xii. 2.; Eph. ii. 11. Gal. iv. 8.; also the mention made of the relation of the Church to those that are without, iv. 12. (compare Col. iv. 5.; Cor. vi. 1.) as well as of unity within, v. 13. A similar growth is observable in the allusion to the duty of the Church to support the teachers of the Gospel when placed side by side with the larger manner in which the same subject is treated in 1 Cor. ix.; 2 Cor. xi. 8. 9.; xii. 13. In all these instances there is the kind of difference that we should expect to find between a thought or precept often dwelt upon and frequently repeated, and the same thought expressed for the first time in few words by a comparatively unpractised writer.

It has been objected against the genuineness of this Epistle, that it contains only a single statement of doctrine. But liveliness, personality, similar traits of disposition, are far more difficult to invent than statements of doctrine. A later age might have supplied these,

but it could hardly have caught the very likeness and portrait of the Apostle. The strength of this argument is considerably increased when it is placed side by side with another of a wholly different kind, derived from mannerisms of style and language. Such are:—

(1.) The expansion and association of words traceable in passages, such as in i. 2—6. 7. 8.

It is an old observation respecting St. Paul, that he is apt to “go off upon a word;” the point to which attention is drawn is an exaggeration of this peculiarity, which renders the connexion, for several verses together, wholly verbal. Other characteristics are the epexegesis of one expression or one verse by another, in apposition with it, as in i. 9. iv. 3. 6.; the aggravation and accumulation of language in such passages as i. 2. 3. 5. 8.; the apparent unmeaningness of some emphatic expressions, ii. 5., iii. 11. v. 27.; the recurrence of the same forms of speech and thought at the commencement of successive verses and paragraphs, i. 9., ii. 1., ii. 3. 5., ii. 7. 11., often traceable at a great distance, as in i. 6., ii. 14.; climaxes, ii. 8., i. 5., in the latter passage with the favourite *οὐ μόνον ἀλλὰ καί*; negative and positive statements of the same thought, ii. 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7.; &c.

(2.) Peculiarities of an other class, found in the Epistles to the Thessalonians as well as in other writings of St. Paul are the following:—

The play of words *δεδοκίμασμεθα, δοκιμάζοντι*, in ii. 4.; the paradox in i. 6., *ἐν θλίψει πολλῇ μετὰ χαρᾶς πνεύματος ἁγίου* (compare Col. xxiv. 12.; 2 Cor. vii. 10., viii. 1.); the mixed metaphor respecting the day of the Lord in v. 5., also in the same passage the double use of *κλέπτῃς, κλέπται* (compare Rom. xiii. 12.; 1 Cor. iii. 15.; and the inversion of thought in Rom. vii. 1.—7.); the substitution of the present for the future, in iii. 19. (compare Rom. ii. 16.); verbal antithesis of prepositions, i. 5., *ἐν ὑμῖν δι’ ὑμᾶς*, iv. 7. *ἐπὶ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ, ἀλλ’ ἐν ἁγιασμῷ*, ii. 3. *οὐκ ἐκ πλάνης οὐδὲ ἐν δόλῳ*; pleonasms as in i. 3., ii. 9., v. 23.; repetition of *γάρ* in several successive verses, i. 8—ii. 1.; use of *γάρ* in question, ii. 19., iii. 9.; resumption of sentence after a digression with *διὰ τοῦτο*, iii. 5., iii. 7.; the use of the double *ἵνα*, iv. 1.; peculiar uses of words and expressions such as *εὐαγγέλιον* for the preaching of the Gospel, 1 Thess. i. 5.; *ἀγών*,

Col. iii. 1.; 1 Thess. ii. 2., to express the passionate earnestness of his feelings towards his converts ; *χαρὰ ἡ στέφανος*, 1 Thess. ii. 19. ; Phil. iv. 1., said also of his converts ; *ἵνα μὴ ἐπιβαρῶ*, 2 Cor. iii. 5. ; *δυνάμενοι ἐν βάρει εἶναι*, 1 Thess. ii. 6., of his burdening the Church with his maintenance. Compare also the following :—

ἄπων τῷ σώματι, παρὼν δὲ τῷ πνεύματι ; 1 Cor. v. 3. *ἐν προσώπῳ καὶ μὴ ἐν καρδίᾳ*, 2 Cor. v. 12. *προσώπῳ οὐ καρδίᾳ*, 1 Thess. ii. 17.

Such intricate similarities of language, such lively traits of character, it is not within the power of any forger to invent and least of all, of a forger of the second century.

THESSALONICA.

THESSALONICA; called in more ancient times Halia, Emathia, and Therma, now Salonichi, was a populous city, the capital of one of the Roman divisions of Macedonia, situated at the north-east corner of the Thermaic Gulf. It was celebrated for its commerce and for the luxury of its inhabitants. Many notices of its history occur in classical authors; none of them, however, are such as connect with the subject of the Epistle. From the Acts of the Apostles we learn that there was a synagogue in the place, which may fairly be regarded as an indication of a large population of Jews (Acts, xvii. 1.). The first Christian Church there was founded by St. Paul, on his second Apostolical journey, after being shamefully entreated at Philippi, the first European city in which he preached the Gospel. The Epistle (1 Thess. ii. 14.) seems to imply that the predominant element was a Gentile one; the Acts of the Apostles, on the other hand, chiefly mentions Jewish proselytes. Whether heathen converts are also included in the words of Acts, xvii. 4., according to Lachmann's reading (*τῶν τε σεβομένων καὶ Ἑλλήνων πλῆθος πολὺ*), is uncertain. The first visit of St. Paul to Thessalonica was probably the occasion on which the Philippians (Phil. iv. 15. 16.). "in the beginning of the Gospel . . sent once and again to his necessity." Once more at least, the Apostle visited Thessalonica, in the year which preceded his last journey to Jerusalem.

It is not one of the objects of the present work, to enter minutely either into the history of the cities to which the Epistles were addressed, or into the local features of the country in which they

were situated. To fill the mind with historical pictures or descriptions of scenery, will not in any degree help us to feel as the Apostles felt, or think as they thought, any more than the history of the reign of George the Third, or a description of the scenery of Somersetshire or Cornwall, would enable us to understand the life and character of Wesley or Whitfield. Interesting as such pictures may be, they tend to withdraw us from a higher interest, which is to be found only in the private character of the Gospel narrative itself.

It is not in the first, but in the second century, that the Church comes into contact with the world. The life of Christ and his Apostles stands in no relation to the public history of their time. None of the great events of the world appear to touch them; no edict of the Roman emperors, with the single exception of the command of Claudius that the Jews should depart from Rome, has the least effect on the fortunes of the infant communion. Even in this case, we arrive at no other result than that Aquila and Priscilla met with St. Paul at Corinth, and may conjecture of the possible influence of the dispersion of so many Jews throughout the empire. No name of any Christian convert in the New Testament can be certainly identified with the name of any one known to us from profane history.

Neither are the descriptions of particular cities or countries at all more instructive. The fact, that at Thessalonica there were many thousand Jews, is of very slight importance in connexion with an Epistle addressed to Gentiles; it is not more than a probability, that we can trace in the erring Galatians the spirit of the worshippers of Cybele or of the followers of Montanus. No amount of research into the history of the time, would inform us of the first question respecting all the Epistles, whether they were addressed to Jews or Gentiles.

Such historical or topographical inquiries are of interest to the antiquarian; they are like the relaxation of foreign travel after severe study: but they have no real connexion with the interpretation of Scripture; and they tend to withdraw the mind from the

true sources of illustration of the Epistles, and the true nature of the earliest Christianity. They lead us away from the internal relation of all Jewish and heathen thought to the truths of the Gospel, to a relation between the Church and the world which is purely accidental and external. They tend to give a national and historical character to Christianity, ere yet it appeared to the eye of man as a phenomenon of history. It is not the least danger of such inquiries that they fill up the void of materials by innumerable conjectures.

The traveller in Greece or in Asia who has followed in the footsteps of the Apostles, who has beheld with his own eyes the same scenes that were looked upon by St. Paul and St. John, is loth to believe that he can add nothing to our knowledge of the Seven Churches, or of the labours of the Apostle of the Gentiles. Those scenes have a never-dying interest ; but it is for themselves alone. Fain would we imagine the sight upon which St. Paul looked, when standing on Mars' Hill, he beheld "the city wholly given to idolatry;" fain would we see in fancy the desert rocks of the sea-girt isle, on which St. John gazed when he wrote the Apocalypse. But we must not transfer to the ancient world our own impressions of nature or of art. Of that sensibility to the beauties of scenery, or of that romantic recollection of the past, which are such remarkable characteristics of our own day, there is no trace in the writings of the New Testament, nor any reason to suppose that they had a place in the minds of its authors.

Taking the other aspect of the subject, we are far from denying that the birth of Christianity is the most interesting of historical facts ; but its interest is also for itself alone : it is not derived from any political influence which the Gospel at first exercised, or from any political causes which may have favoured or given rise to it. In the vastness of the Roman world, it is as a small isolated spot, the light, as it were, of a candle, which must be sought for, not in the court of Cæsar, nor amid the factions of Jerusalem, but in the upper chamber in which the disciples met when "the number of the

names together was about an hundred and twenty, and the doors were shut for fear of the Jews." It is one of those minute facts which escape the eye of the contemporary historian, and must not be drawn before its time into the circle of political events. Its first greatness is the very contrast which it presents with the greatness of history. Strange it is to think of the contemporary heathen world, of Tiberius at Capreæ, of the Roman senate, of the solid framework of the Roman empire itself. But when this first feeling of surprise has passed away, we become aware that the page of Tacitus, or even of Josephus, adds nothing worth speaking of, to our knowledge of the earliest Christianity. The most remarkable fact supplied by them is their unconsciousness of its importance.

DATE AND PLACE OF WRITING.

NEITHER the date at which the First Epistle to the Thessalonians was written, nor the place from which it was written, can be determined with exact certainty ; but little doubt can be entertained that it must have been written either at Athens or Corinth, and therefore either before the Apostle went to Corinth or during the eighteen months' stay in that city which closes his second Apostolical journey. The only other possible supposition, that it was written from Asia Minor, is not, indeed, directly contradicted by any fact mentioned in the Epistle, but is inconsistent with its general tone and character ; for from 1 Thess. iii. 6. it is obvious that the Epistle was written shortly, if not immediately, after the return of Timothy (" But now, when Timotheus came from us to you "). But Timothy was sent to Thessalonica during the Apostle's stay at Athens, after which intervened the eighteen months' sojourn at Corinth. Hence, if the Epistle was written from Ephesus or some other place in Asia Minor, the Apostle would be referring, in the expression just quoted, to what had taken place two years before. But no one would use such an expression, or refer so precisely to his feelings at the time as St. Paul does in the preceding verses (iii. 1—5.), if he were speaking of what was separated from him by so long an interval.

Still we have not determined whether the Epistle was written from Athens or Corinth. In the examination of this question, another is involved, which will be more fully discussed elsewhere. The third chapter of the First Epistle to the Thessalonians is commonly thought to be, in some particulars, inconsistent with the corresponding passage in the Acts. In the Epistle, Timothy appears to be sent

back from Athens, while, in the Acts, he is left behind at Berea (Acts xvii. 14., "But Silas and Timotheus abode there still"), and comes up with the Apostle again at Corinth after he has left Athens. (1.) This discrepancy has been regarded by Paley as an undesigned coincidence, the Epistle, as he conceives, supplying a circumstance (viz., the return of Timothy from Athens to Thessalonica) which makes statements in the history more natural and probable. For a fuller investigation of this question, and an examination of the difficulties in which Paley's hypothesis is involved, the reader is referred to the note on the *Horæ Paulinæ*. (2.) It may be further maintained that the discrepancy itself is not real, but apparent; for it is not expressly asserted that it was from Athens that Timothy was sent back. St. Paul's solitude at Athens might be the consequence of Timothy's visit; but the sending may have been from Berea to Thessalonica. And it might be further suggested, that the words "but Satan hindered me," in ii. 18., referred to the persecutions which prevented the Apostle himself returning from Berea to Thessalonica. This is a possible hypothesis; but it must be admitted to run counter to the first and most obvious meaning of the words of the Epistle. (3.) We may suppose an inaccuracy in the Acts, the writer of which may not have known of the lengthened stay of the Apostle at Athens.

Taking the language of the Epistle only, our natural inference would be, that the time at which it was written was not long after the conversion of the Thessalonians, very shortly after the Apostle had sent Timothy from Athens, and immediately after the return of Timothy from visiting his converts. Whether, on the return of Timothy, St. Paul was at the same place from which he sent Timothy, or not,—at Athens, that is, or at Corinth—it would be idle to inquire. He may have been at Athens, he may have been at Corinth; he may have returned from one to the other, he may have been in the neighbourhood of either. This is the real, though not very precise, result of an examination of the Epistle itself. A probability or two might be added from a comparison of the

Acts; but we shall do better to confine ourselves to the natural meaning of the Epistle, without seeking to form a tortuous harmony by the uncertain insertion of additional circumstances derived from other sources. The statements of the Epistle are a real confirmation of the narrative of the Acts; and the degree of coincidence in the narrative of the Acts is a sufficient evidence that the Epistle must have been written on the second Apostolical journey.

SUBJECT OF THE EPISTLE.

LIKE the other writings of St. Paul, the First Epistle to the Thessalonians may be divided into two parts: the one personal, the other doctrinal or practical. The one relating to them, chap. i., and to himself, chap. ii. and iii.; the other comprising practical exhortations, iv. and v., to sanctification, to quietness, to obedience, to peace, combined with instruction as to the coming of Christ, iii. 12., and the duty of watchfulness against his appearing.

An epistle is apt to appear to us irrelevant if we ask too precisely for its object. It is not a treatise, nor a sermon, nor necessarily written with any particular design, or confined to a particular subject. It is the natural outpouring of the Apostle's soul to those whom he esteems "very highly in love for Christ's sake." It says much of them in thankfulness for their conversion; it says much of himself to awaken their sympathy. The exact bearing of each verse on a particular end, is not to be considered. The best lessons and the highest truths are often taught in the most indirect manner, arising many times from the most incidental occasions, gleaming through natural affection, suggested often by commendation rather than by rebuke of the persons to whom they are addressed. Nothing can be more indirect, or occasional, than most of the Epistles of St. Paul: they seem to have hardly any set purpose; they are the fragments or remains of his life, not the exposition of his system. Unmeaning they can only appear when we judge them by a modern standard, and when losing sight of him and his converts, we attempt to elicit from them notions of philosophy, or revelations of the unseen world.

Of the First Epistle to the Thessalonians, it may be truly said that

it is without an object. That is, it has no other object but to confirm their faith and remind them of what they owed to the Apostle, as a motive for their continuance in the lesson which he had taught them. The greater part of it is a simple narrative of "his manner of entering into them" and its results. As though he had said, "Remember who it was who showed you these things; who drew you towards him with cords of love, as a nurse among her children, as a father with his sons." But love cannot abstain from exhortation; not that it has new commands to give, or fresh lessons to impart, but the very excess of love pours itself forth in thrice-told admonitions and consolations. Like a parent with his children, the Apostle repeats the commonest precepts, not because they know them not, but in the hope that this time they may strike home upon them with some peculiar force or influence.

From the personal narrative which, in the first half of the Epistle, he has made the vehicle of his instruction, he passes on to a more general lesson. There is no peculiar appropriateness in the manner in which the topics of the fourth and fifth chapters follow one another. They are, first, purity; secondly, love of the brethren; thirdly, the state of the departed, and the coming of Christ; fourthly, peace and order; these are followed by particular and apparently disjointed precepts. It is not impossible to trace a connexion of the second and fourth with the third in the series; for affection for one another may have led to an inquiry "concerning them which are asleep," and the belief in the approaching Advent, with which the anxiety about the dead was connected, may have been the source of disorder in the Church. But while admitting this latent thread of association, it would be forced to attempt to trace such a connexion throughout. More naturally we may suppose that, as in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, the Apostle writes without connexion, as the several subjects occur to him, or may have been suggested by the news of Timothy, as in the former case by certain of the household of Chloe.

The subject which stands out most prominently in this latter por-

tion of the Epistle, is the state of the departed. The formula with which it is introduced reminds us of the similar formula at the commencement of the tenth chapter of the First of Corinthians, "Moreover, brethren, I would not have you ignorant;" which, in the same way, forms a transition to a fresh topic. It is closely connected with that which is the under current of the whole Epistle, the near approach of the coming of Christ; and probably arises out of some inquiry made of the Apostle by those who were sorrowing for lost friends or kinsmen, who seemed to them not only to have passed like the Israelites of old, from the presence of God, but from the hope of Messiah's kingdom.

The ground of consolation is the same as that of 1 Cor. xv. 21., "Since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead;" 1 Thess. iv. 14., "If we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will Christ bring with him;" though the form is different. It is the object of the Apostle to do away with the dreary thought which we infer the Thessalonians to have entertained, that they were for ever separated from the dead. Their heaven was on earth, where they were expecting the reign of the Lord Jesus Christ. The Apostle comforts them with the assurance that, even if they should not go to the dead, the dead should return to them; that in that kingdom they were not to be parted, but together, the living with the dead, and both with Christ.

ΠΡΟΣ ΘΕΣΣΑΛΟΝΙΚΕΙΣ
Α.

ΠΡΟΣ ΘΕΣΣΑΛΟΝΙΚΕΙΣ Α.

ΠΑΥΛΟΣ καὶ Σιλουανὸς καὶ Τιμόθεος τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ 1
 Θεσσαλονικέων ἐν θεῷ πατρὶ καὶ κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ χριστῷ.
 χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη [ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου
 Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ].

I. Παῦλος καὶ Σιλουανὸς καὶ Τιμόθεος, *Paul and Silvanus and Timotheus*.] St. Paul omits the title of Apostle, either because he had not yet assumed it, or because his name here, as in the Epistle to the Philippians, is associated with others; or in accordance with the absence of the tone of authority which generally marks the Epistle. The manner and the steps by which he came to be recognised as on a level with the Twelve, and "not a whit behind the chiefest of the Apostles," can no longer be traced. In the Epistle which follows next in chronological order we find him earnestly asserting his claim to apostolical authority, and appealing to the success of his teaching as the seal of his mission. Whether the enforcement of such a claim in the Galatians, or the omission of the title in the Epistles to the Thessalonians, can be regarded as indications that there was a time at which his apostleship was not universally recognised, or the right to it asserted by himself, are questions which may be suggested, but cannot be satisfactorily answered. Probably the name Apostle, which in its general sense was used of many, was gradually, and at no definite period, applied to him with the

same special meaning as to the Apostles at Jerusalem. Cf. 2 Cor. viii. 23.; xi. 5.; 1 Cor. iv. 9.; Rom. xvi. 7., and below, ii. 6. He is not mentioned with the Twelve in the Book of the Revelation (c. xxi. 14).

Silvanus is the Silas of the Acts, first mentioned in chap. xv. 22. 32, as a chief man and a prophet among the brethren at Jerusalem. He was sent down to Antioch on a mission relating to the disputes about circumcision. After his mission was fulfilled he remained with St. Paul, whom he accompanied on his second Apostolical journey. The last mention of him in the Acts is found in xviii. 5., on the occasion of his overtaking the Apostle at Corinth, where he joined him in preaching the Gospel (2 Cor. i. 19.). Once more the name occurs, in 1 Pet. v. 12. If it be the name of the same person, he must be supposed to have left St. Paul, and to have followed St. Peter to Babylon (v. 13.).

Timotheus is mentioned in Acts xvi. 1. as "the son of a certain woman which was a Jewess, and believed; but his father was a Greek." It was at Lystra, in Lycaonia, St. Paul met with him, on his second Apostolical journey

I. THESSALONIANS.

1 PAUL, and Silvanus, and Timotheus, unto the church of the Thessalonians in God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ : Grace unto you, and peace [from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ].

(whether after a previous acquaintance on his first journey or not, is not stated), and, intending him to go forth with him, had him circumcised, to obviate the prejudice with which, as a preacher of the Gospel, he might be regarded among the Jews, in consequence of his half Gentile extraction. He accompanied Paul on his two journeys into Greece, was probably with him at Philippi and Thessalonica (though not expressly mentioned as sharing in the persecutions of the Apostle and Silas), and certainly at Corinth (Acts, xviii. 5.). On the occasion of St. Paul's last journey he sent on Timothy from Ephesus into Macedonia (Acts, xix. 22.); thence to Corinth (1 Cor. iv. 17.); from which latter place he returned and met the Apostle on his journey thither, in Macedonia (2 Cor. i. 1.). He was with him at the time of writing the Epistle to the Romans, that is, in Corinth or its neighbourhood (Rom. xvi. 21.); was sent forward to Troas on his return through Macedonia (Acts, xx. 5.), and reappears as the companion of St. Paul during his imprisonment at Rome (Phil. i. 1; Col. i. 1; Philem. 1.). The last mention of his name oc-

curs in Heb. xiii. 23.:—"Know ye that our brother Timothy is set at liberty."

No one so much as Timothy bore the image of St. Paul himself: "He worketh the work of the Lord, as I also do." (1 Cor. xvi. 10.) "For I have no man like minded, who will naturally care for your state" (Phil. ii. 20.). "As a son with the father, he hath served with me in the Gospel" (22.).

τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, to the church,] Gal., Cor., Thess.; but τοῖς ἁγίοις . . . κλητοῖς ἁγίοις, in Romans, Ephesians, Philippians, and Colossians. It cannot be inferred from this difference of expression, that the latter Epistles were addressed to private persons, as Philippi and Ephesus were quite as likely to have had regular Churches as Galatia and Thessalonica. Yet it is remarkable that the change of form should occur in all the later Epistles; perhaps because the Apostle, more and more in his later years, invested the Church on earth with the attributes of the Church in heaven. The word ἐκκλησία is used in the LXX. for the congregation, indifferently with συναγωγή. It is found also in the Gospel of St.

Εὐχαριστοῦμεν τῷ θεῷ πάντοτε περὶ πάντων ὑμῶν ²
 μνηΐαν¹ ποιούμενοι ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν ἡμῶν, ἀδιαλείπτως ³
 μνημονεύοντες ὑμῶν τοῦ ἔργου τῆς πίστεως καὶ τοῦ κόπου
 τῆς ἀγάπης καὶ τῆς ὑπομονῆς τῆς ἐλπίδος τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν
 Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἡμῶν,

¹ Add ὑμῶν.

St. Matthew; in the Epistles of St. John and St. James, as well as in the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Book of the Revelation. It could not, therefore, have belonged to any one party or division of the Church. In the time of St. Paul it was the general term, and was gradually appropriated to the Christian Church. All the sacred associations with which that was invested as the body of Christ, were transferred to it, and the words, *συναγωγή* and *ἐκκλησία*, soon became as distinct as the things to which they were applied. The very rapidity with which *ἐκκλησία* acquired its new meaning, is a proof of the life and force which from the first the thought of communion with one another must have exerted on the minds of the earliest believers. Some indication of the transition is traceable in Heb. ii. 12. where the words of Ps. xxii. 23., "in the midst of the church will I sing praise unto thee," are adopted in a Christian sense; also in Heb. xii. 23., where the Old and New Testament meanings of *ἐκκλησία* are similarly blended.

ἐν θεῷ πατρί, *in God the Father*] is closely connected with the preceding words. All things in their highest aspect, churches, individuals, the actions, feelings, and words of men, are in God and Christ; they pass out of themselves into union with the Divine na-

ture. Such modes of expression are no longer in use among ourselves; to the best of men they would appear mystical. Yet so it was the early Church thought and felt.

χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη, *grace unto you and peace.*] The Christian form of salutation, being an adaptation of the Greek *χαίρειν*, united with the Hebrew *שלום*.

ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, *from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ.*] These words are omitted by about half the MS. authorities, and are probably interpolated from the salutations of other epistles. It may be argued, that either their omission or insertion was occasioned by the ἐν θεῷ πατρί, which precedes.

2—10. Few passages are more characteristic of the style of St. Paul than that on which we are entering. First, as it is the overflowing of his soul in thankfulness for his converts, about whom he can never say too much. Secondly, in the very form and structure of the sentences, which seem to grow under his hand, gaining force in each successive clause by the repetition and expansion of the preceding. A classical or modern writer distinguishes his several propositions, assigning to each its exact relation to what goes before and follows, that he may give meaning and articulation to the whole.

2 We give thanks to God always for you all, making
3 mention of you in our prayers; remembering without
ceasing your work of faith, and labour of love, and
patience of hope in our Lord Jesus Christ, in the sight
4 of our God* and Father; knowing, brethren beloved of

The manner of St. Paul is the reverse of this. He overlays one proposition with another, the second just emerging beyond the first, and arising out of association with it, but not always standing in a clear relation to it. Thus in the passage which we are considering, ἀδιαλείπτως μνημονεύοντες, in ver. 3., is a repetition of εὐχαριστοῦμεν πάντοτε and μείαν ποιούμενοι, in ver. 2. Again, with reference to the latter words themselves, it is impossible to determine whether μείαν ποιούμενοι is an addition to, or a limitation on, εὐχαριστοῦμεν. A little lower down, ver. 5., the clause ὅτι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, κ. τ. λ. is a sort of afterthought on τὴν ἐκλογήν. In like manner, whether in the words καὶ ὑμεῖς μιμηταὶ in the 6th verse, the Apostle carries in his thoughts the preceding οἴδατε, or not, is uncertain. Ver. 8. is an amplification of ver. 7., and in ver. 8. itself the language of the second clause is varied from that of the first, without any variation of meaning; in v. 9. the words, δουλεύειν θεῷ ζῶντι καὶ ἀληθινῷ, are an extension of the preceding ἐπεστρέψατε πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ἀπὸ τῶν εἰδώλων. At the commencement of chap. ii. we appear to break off and pass on to a new subject, and yet are but resuming the thread of ver. 5. and 6. in the preceding.

Leaving the form, let us go on to the substance. The Apostle is full of thankfulness to God, for

the conversion of the Thessalonians, which has brought forth such unmistakeable fruits of righteousness. These are just in accordance with the manner of their reception of the Gospel, the manner in which he preached and they believed. It seemed to have a peculiar power over them, received with joy amid persecutions; they were as burning and shining lights in all that land. Their conversion was in all men's mouths, who could not help, of their own accord, telling even the Apostle himself how these idolaters had come to the knowledge of the true God; and how they, like the other disciples, had learned to sit waiting for the day of the Lord. In such manner does the Apostle, in the excess of his affection for them, not without knowledge of the way in which to approach human nature, transform the language of compliment into a spiritual lesson.

2. εὐχαριστοῦμεν, *we give thanks.*] The plural, as in chap. ii. 13. 17. 18., iii. 1., is most naturally explained by being referred exclusively to St. Paul. The personal feelings of thankfulness as here, the desire to see them (ii. 18.), the sense of weakness (iii. 1.), can hardly refer to others than himself.

πάντοτε, with εὐχαριστεῖν.] Compare 2 Thess. ii. 13.

περὶ πάντων ὑμῶν, *for all of you.*] Forgetting none; such is our never failing habit.

εἰδότες, ἀδελφοὶ ἡγαπημένοι ὑπὸ θεοῦ, τὴν ἐκλογὴν ὑμῶν, 4
ὅτι τὸ εὐαγγελιον ἡμῶν οὐκ ἐγενήθη πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐν λόγῳ 5
μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν δυνάμει καὶ ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ καὶ ἐν
πληροφορίᾳ πολλῇ, καθὼς οἴδατε οἶοι ἐγενήθημεν ἐν ὑμῶν
δι' ὑμᾶς, καὶ ὑμεῖς μιμηταὶ ἡμῶν ἐγενήθητε καὶ τοῦ κυρίου, 6
δεξάμενοι τὸν λόγον ἐν θλίψει πολλῇ μετὰ χαρᾶς πνεύματος

μνησθῆναι, making mention.] Either (1.) making mention of, or remembering you in our prayers; or (2.) as we make mention of or remember you in our prayers. According to the latter interpretation, the second clause is not a limitation on the first, the meaning being, "We never mention your name in our prayers without giving thanks."

3. Here, as in 1 Cor. xiii., faith, hope, and love, meet together in one.

τοῦ ἔργου τῆς πίστεως, work of faith.] has been variously explained as meaning the reality of your faith, or the fact of your receiving the Gospel, or the working of your faith. Better your work of faith, that is, the Christian life which springs from faith. (Comp. 2 Thess. i. 11.)

τοῦ κόπου τῆς ἀγάπης, labour of love.] The labour which love undergoes, a love that avoids no sacrifices and shuns no toils for the good of others. Such as their own Jason had shown amid persecutions, in Acts, xvii. Comp. Heb. iii. 10. :—"For God is not unrighteous to forget your work and love which ye have shewed towards his name, in that ye have ministered to the saints and do minister."

ὑπομονῆς τῆς ἐλπίδος, patience of hope.] The patience which is sustained by hope. (Comp. Rom.

iv. 18., viii. 24.) Remembering, the Apostle would say, your faith, hope, and love; a faith that had its outward effect on your lives; a love that spent itself in the service of others; a hope that was no mere transient feeling, but was content to wait for the things unseen, when Christ should be revealed. Compare 2 Thess. iii. 5. *εἰς τὴν ὑπομονὴν τοῦ χριστοῦ.*

ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἡμῶν, in the sight of God and our Father.] These words may be either connected with *μνημονεύοντες*, "remembering you in the presence of God our Father;" and regarded as answering to "making mention of you in our prayers," in the preceding verse; or the Apostle may intend to express that their faith, hope, and charity, were in the presence of God, and had gone up before Him. (Comp. note on ver. 1.) The latter is confirmed by the order of the words and the common use of language in St. Paul (Rom. iv. 17., xiv. 22.).

4. ὑπὸ Θεοῦ is to be taken with ἡγαπημένοι, as 2 Thess. ii. 13.: ἡγαπημένοι ὑπὸ κυρίου.

εἰδότες τὴν ἐκλογὴν, knowing your election.] Either knowing that ye are elect, or knowing the manner of your election to the Gospel, of which the following verse serves as a further elucidation. Compare οἴδατε τὴν εἰσόδον

- 5 God, your * election, in* that our gospel came not unto you in word only, but also in power, and in the Holy Ghost, and in much assurance; as ye know what manner of men we were among you for your sake; and ye became followers of us, and of the Lord, having received the word in much affliction, with joy of the Holy

ὅτι οὐ κενὴ γέγονεν, ii. 1.; and βλέπετε τὴν κλήσιν ὑμῶν, 1 Cor. i. 26. The Apostle calls to mind their reception of the Gospel, which showed that they had received the Spirit and were elect of God. (Compare Gal. iii. 1. 2.)

5. τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἡμῶν, *our Gospel.*] Our preaching of the Gospel. Compare Rom. xvi. 25.; Gal. ii. 7.

ἐν λόγῳ μόνον, *in word only,*] is to be referred to the influence of his preaching on the Thessalonians. Our preaching was not a mere word.

ἐν δυνάμει, *in power.*] But had a power over your hearts, and was followed by gifts of the Spirit. Compare 1 Cor. ii. 4., οὐκ ἐν πειθοῖς σοφίας λόγοις, ἀλλ' ἐν δυνάμει Θεοῦ; also 1 Cor. iv. 19. It has been said that the words "in the Holy Spirit" could only refer to the Apostle's mode of preaching, not to the gifts by which it was accompanied, and which were beyond his power to produce. But does the Apostle thus separate himself from the Spirit working in him? rather ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ implies the communion of the Spirit with himself and them, or in other words, the inspiration of the speaker caught by the hearers, whose acceptance of it was the evidence of its spiritual power.

ἐν πληροφορίᾳ πολλῇ, *in much assurance,*] may admit of three

explanations:—(1.) with much certainty; or (2.) with much fullness of spiritual gifts; or (3.) with much effect or fulfilment.

καθὼς οἴδατε, *as ye know.*] In the preceding words the Apostle has been describing the effect of his preaching, on the hearts of his hearers: "It came to you not in word merely, but in power." It was a mutual influence, "so we preached, and so ye believed." In what follows, the Apostle expresses this more clearly. "Ye know what we were among you for your sakes (δι' ὑμᾶς), and ye followed our example, and the Lord's." καθὼς οἴδατε contains also a faint opposition to εἰδότες. We know the manner of your election, as ye to whom we appeal bear witness of our behaviour among you.

6. καὶ ὑμεῖς, in the next verse, may be regarded, either as a continuation of the preceding οἴοι, or as a new sentence. Compare 1 Cor. xi. 1.: μιμηταὶ μου γένησθε, καθὼς καὶ γὼ χριστοῦ.

ἐν θλίψει πολλῇ, *in much affliction.*] Compare the words of Christ, Matt. v. 11.; Luke, vi. 22.; Mark, x. 30. The narrative of their persecutions is given in Acts, xviii., arising, as in most places, from the enmity of the Jews.

The suffering that comes from without, cannot depress the spirit of a man who is faithful in a good cause. It is only when "from

ἀγίου, ὥστε γενέσθαι ὑμᾶς τύπον¹ πᾶσιν τοῖς πιστεύουσιν 7
 ἐν τῇ Μακεδονίᾳ καὶ ἐν τῇ² Ἀχαΐᾳ. ἀφ' ὑμῶν γὰρ ἐξήχηται 8
 ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου οὐ μόνον ἐν τῇ Μακεδονίᾳ καὶ ἐν τῇ²
 Ἀχαΐᾳ, ἀλλ'³ ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν ἢ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν
 ἐξελέλυθεν, ὥστε μὴ χρεῖαν ἔχειν ἡμᾶς⁴ λαλεῖν τι. Αὐτοῖς 9
 γὰρ περὶ ἡμῶν ἀπαγγέλλουσιν, ὁποῖαν εἴσοδον ἔσχομεν⁵
 πρὸς ὑμᾶς, καὶ πῶς ἐπεστρέψατε πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ἀπὸ τῶν
 εἰδώλων, δουλεύειν θεῷ ζῶντι καὶ ἀληθινῷ καὶ ἀναμένειν 10
 τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν, ὃν ἡγείρειν ἐκ τῶν⁶ νεκρῶν,
 Ἰησοῦν τὸν ρυόμενον ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τῆς ὀργῆς τῆς ἐρχομένης.

¹ τύπους.² Omit ἐν τῇ.³ Add καί.⁴ ἡμᾶς ἔχειν.⁵ ἔχομεν.⁶ Omit τῶν.

within are fears" that the mind is enslaved. For in the spiritual world joy and sorrow are not two, but one. The servant of Christ feels a sort of exhilaration at the contrast between himself and the world, similar to that of the soldier on the battle field, in the presence of danger and death. He is not like another man, but at once above and below others; he has the sentence of death in himself, and is yet more than a conqueror. It is this peculiarity of the Christian character that the Apostle expresses by "joy of the Holy Ghost," "glorying in the Lord," "fulness of consolation:" compare the alternations of feeling in 2 Cor. vi. 10.: "As sorrowful, yet always rejoicing."

χαρὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου = χαρὰ πνευματικῇ, or ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ.

8. ἀφ' ὑμῶν γὰρ ἐξήχηται, *for from you has been sounded out.* Not you became preachers of the Gospel to others, or you were an example to others, or beginning with you first, I preached to others; but from you first the word has

made itself felt, as it were, with the sound of a trumpet, and your conversion was so remarkable that it attracted the eyes of men; the light shone upon all Macedonia and Achaia, and in all other places.

ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ, *in every place.*

How could it be said, that the faith of the Thessalonians was known everywhere? It has been sometimes attempted to remove this difficulty by taking μόνον with ἐξήχηται, which is objectionable, however, both upon the ground of the order of the words and the poor sense. It is better to admit that the language of St. Paul, uttered in the fullness of his heart, is not to be construed strictly, any more than where he says, in like manner, that the faith of the Romans was known over the whole world (Rom. i. 8.). He means in other words, that not only in Greece, but in Asia, wherever there were believers, the news of the Thessalonian conversion had spread, or rather must have spread; he had no need to speak of them,

7 Ghost : so that ye were an ensample¹ to all that believe
 8 in Macedonia and in² Achaia. For from you has * been
 sounded out the word of the Lord not only in Macedonia
 and in² Achaia, but³ in every place your faith to God-
 9 ward is spread abroad ; so that we need not to speak any
 thing. For they themselves shew of us what manner of
 entering in we had unto you, and how ye turned to
 10 God from idols to serve the living and true God, and to
 wait for his Son from heaven, whom he raised from the
 dead, Jesus, which delivereth* us from the wrath to come.

¹ Ensamples.

² Omit in.

³ Add also.

for the report of them had preceded him on his way.

It is not necessary that these latter words should be connected with *ἐν παντί τόπῳ* ; the meaning would be assisted if, instead of adopting Lachmann's punctuation, the clause, *ὥστε μὴ χρεῖαν ἔχειν ἡμᾶς λαλεῖν τι*, were separated by a colon from *ἐξελέλυθεν*, and closely joined with the following verse.

9. *Αὐτοί, they themselves.*] They whom you might expect to be asking questions of us, come instead to us, and tell us of your friendly reception of us and of your conversion. For *αὐτοὶ* in this sense compare John, xvi. 27.

ὁποῖαν εἴσοδον, what an entrance we had to you,] i. e. with what success we preached the Gospel.

καὶ πῶς ἐπεστρέψατε, and how ye turned.] And how ye turned from idols to serve the living God of Jew and Gentile. Compare Gal. iv. 8:—"Howbeit then, when ye knew not God, ye did service to them which by nature are no gods." Yet in both Churches there must have been a Jewish as well

as a Gentile element, Acts, xvii. 4. ; Gal. iv. 9.

10. It appears remarkable that St. Paul should make the essence of the Gospel consist, not in the belief in Christ, or in taking up the cross of Christ, but in the hope of his coming again. Such, however, was the faith of the Thessalonian Church, such is the tone and spirit of the Epistle. Neither in the Apostolic times, nor in our own, can we reduce all to the same type. One aspect of the Gospel is more outward, another more inward ; one seems to connect with the life of Christ, another with his death ; one with his birth into the world, another with his coming again. If we will not insist on determining the times and the seasons, or on knowing the manner how, all these different ways may lead us within the veil. The faith of modern times embraces many parts or truths ; yet we allow men, according to their individual character to dwell on this truth, or that, as more peculiarly appropriate to their nature. The faith of the early Church was simpler and more

Αὐτοὶ γὰρ οἶδατε, ἀδελφοί, τὴν εἰσόδον ἡμῶν τὴν πρὸς 2
 ὑμᾶς, ὅτι οὐ κενὴ γέγονεν, ἀλλὰ¹ προπαθόντες καὶ ὕβρι- 2
 σθέντες καθὼς οἶδατε ἐν Φιλίπποις, ἐπαρρήσιασάμεθα ἐν τῷ
 θεῷ ἡμῶν λαλῆσαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν
 πολλῷ ἄγωνι. ἡ γὰρ παράκλησις ἡμῶν οὐκ ἐκ πλάνης 3

¹ Add καί.

progressive, pausing in the same way on a particular truth, which the circumstances of the world or the Church brought before them.

τὸν ῥυόμενον ἡμᾶς.] The Saviour from the wrath that is to be. Comp. ii. 16.; 2 Thess. i. 8.

II. The personal narrative which follows, may be compared with that in the Galatians, i. 11. to ii. 14. Alluding to the spirit in which he preached to them, he glances, for an instant, at the persecution which he had just before endured at Philippi, and which had not deterred him from speaking the truth boldly, though at Thessalonica too the conflict was hot. He had spoken as to God and not to men, without covetousness, or guile, or flattery, or vain glory, or any such thing. He had given up his right to support as an Apostle from the excess of his love to them; a love, which would fain have made him lay down his life for their sake. They must surely remember, how they had seen him toiling day and night to get his own livelihood; they were the witnesses (and there was a higher witness) of the innocence of his life, and of his gentle and fatherly admonitions to them.

Then changing the person, he gives thanks to God as at first, for their reception of the Words

of God; they had become followers of the Churches in Judea, and stood in the same relation to their own countrymen, as these did to the Jews. The persecutions that they suffered, did but recall the thought of what these latter had done to the Lord Jesus, and to their own prophets; enemies, as they were, of God and man, forbidding to preach to the Gentiles that they might be saved. Their evil was tending to a consummation, and the wrath of God was fulfilled upon them.

In the verses which follow, there appears to be an abrupt transition to the longing desire that the Apostle had to see them, and the efforts that he had made to accomplish this purpose. The 15th and 16th verses are a digression which may be regarded as an outburst of indignation at the Jews. As in conversation we sometimes ask, "What leads another to say that?" so here we can but guess the secret thread of association, which carries on the mind of the Apostle from one topic to another. The real connexion in what follows may probably be the persecutions of the Thessalonian Church, just slightly touched upon in verse 14., which quickened the Apostle's desire to see them, and increased his sense of loneliness in being parted from them. This thread reappears

- 2 For yourselves, brethren, know our entrance in unto
 2 you, that it was not in vain: but¹ after that we had
 suffered before, and were shamefully entreated, as ye
 know, at Philippi, we were bold in our God to speak
 3 unto you the gospel of God with much contention. For

¹ Add even.

again in the following chapter, iii. 2—9.

1. αὐτοὶ γὰρ οἶδατε, *for ye yourselves know.*] After narrating what he knew himself, and what others told him, the Apostle goes on to appeal to their own consciousness. As though he said:—“I need not quote other, for you yourselves are my best witnesses.” The words οἶδατε and εἰσοδον are a connecting link with verses 5. and 9. of the preceding chapter.

ὅτι οὐ κενὴ γέγονεν, *that it was not in vain.*] Compare for the form of the sentence, Gal. i. 11.: γνωρίζω δὲ ὑμῖν, ἀδελφοί, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τὸ εὐαγγελισθὲν ὑπ’ ἐμοῦ, ὅτι οὐκ ἔστι κατ’ ἄνθρωπον. κενὴ refers both to the power of the Apostle’s preaching, and to its effect on the mind of the hearers. Compare 1 Cor. xv. 10. 58.

2. But although we had suffered before, and been injuriously handled at Philippi, as need not to be told you, we were bold in our God, to speak to you the Gospel of Christ, amid much conflict: ἐπαρρησιασάμεθα λαλῆσαι = ἐτολμῶμεν μετὰ παρρησίας λαλῆσαι. Compare Eph. vi. 20.; and for ἐπαρρησιασάμεθα ἐν τῷ Θεῷ, Acts, ix. 28.

2. ἐν πολλῷ ἀγῶνι, *with much contention.*] Corresponds to προπαθόντες, and alludes to the tumult mentioned in the Acts, xvii. 5., and to the Apostle’s feelings in it:—“But the Jews which

believed not, moved with envy, took unto them certain lewd fellows of the baser sort, and gathered a company, and set all the city on an uproar, and assaulted the house of Jason, and sought to bring them out to the people.” The Apostle means to say, that they were not deterred by persecution at Philippi, from preaching boldly at Thessalonica, though there was persecution too there. For a reference to a similar scene recorded in the Acts, compare 2 Cor. i. 8—10. In both it was an inward struggle as well as an outward one; as in the latter passage he says, though in another spirit, “Without were fightings, within were fears.”

3. ἡ γὰρ παράκλησις ἡμῶν, *for our exhortation.*] “For we had truth to support us, and we spoke as the ministers of God.” Or as the Apostle has expanded the thought: For our exhortation did not arise from a spirit of deception, nor from impure motives, nor was it uttered in craft. This was the reason why we were bold to preach. Compare for a similar use of γάρ, Rom. i. 15. 16.: οὕτω τὸ κατ’ ἐμὲ πρόθυμον καὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς ἐν Ῥώμῃ εὐαγγελίσασθαι. οὐ γὰρ ἐπαισχύνομαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον· δύναμις γὰρ Θεοῦ ἐστὶν εἰς σωτηρίαν παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι.

The two senses of παράκλησις, exhortation and consolation, so easily passing into one another

οὐδὲ ἐξ ἀκαθαρσίας οὐδὲ¹ ἐν δόλῳ, ἀλλὰ καθὼς δεδοκιμά- 4
σμεθα ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ πιστευθῆναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, οὕτως
λαλοῦμεν, οὐχ ὡς ἀνθρώποις ἀρέσκοντες, ἀλλὰ [τῷ] θεῷ
τῷ δοκιμάζοντι τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν. οὔτε γάρ ποτε ἐν λόγῳ 5
κολακείας ἐγενήθημεν, καθὼς οἴδατε, οὔτε ἐν προφάσει
πλεονεξίας (θεὸς μάρτυς), οὔτε ζητοῦντες ἐξ ἀνθρώπων 6
δόξαν, οὔτε ἀφ' ὑμῶν οὔτε ἀπ' ἄλλων, δυνάμενοι ἐν βάρει
εἶναι ὡς χριστοῦ ἀπόστολοι, ἀλλ' ἐγενήθημεν νήπιοι² ἐν 7

¹ οὔτε² ἡπιοι.

(compare ver. 11.), are suggestive of the external state of the early Church, sorrowing amid the evils of the world, and needing as its first lesson to be comforted, and not less suggestive of the first lesson of the Gospel to the individual soul of peace in believing.

ἐξ ἀκαθαρσίας, *of uncleanness.*] May be explained in this place by πλεονεξία, as elsewhere πλεονεξία by ἀκαθαρσία, Eph. v. 3. It is, however, more probable, that it is used in its original sense, the same sense in which the Apostle says, 2 Cor. vii. 2. οὐδένα ἐφθείραμεν.

Many passages in the New Testament lead us to infer, that there existed in the age of the Apostles, a connexion between the form of spirituality and licentiousness. It is this of which the Apostle declares his innocence, and with which elsewhere he upbraids the false teachers.

4. But as God tried us, and intrusted us with the Gospel, we do not betray our trust, we speak not as men-pleasers, but acceptable to God, who tried us. οὕτως λαλοῦμεν refers both to καθὼς δεδοκιμάσμεθα and to the οὐχ ὡς which follows. The Apostle means to express two things:

first, that he spoke as one tried by God; and, secondly, that, as God tried him, it was to Him he sought to be accepted, and not to man. Compare for the meaning, 1 Cor. iv. 3.; Gal. i. 10.: for the expression, 1 Cor. vii. 25., ἡλεμένος ὑπὸ κυρίου πιστὸς εἶναι; Rom. i. 28.: and for the use of οὕτως, 1 Thess. ii. 8. δεδοκιμάσμεθα is not simply equivalent to ἡξιώμεθα, but rather to δεδοκιμασμένοι ἡξιώμεθα.

5. οὔτε γάρ ποτε ἐν λόγῳ κολακείας ἐγενήθημεν, *for neither at any time.*] For the form of the expression, compare 1 Tim. ii. 14.: ἡ γυνὴ ἐξαπατηθεῖσα ἐν παραβάσει γέγονεν. "We did not use words such as flattery uses, or pretexts, such as avarice." That this is the true sense of the genitive is proved by its being the only one applicable to both members of the sentence. The word πρύφασις in the second clause is a slight variation of λόγος in the previous one.

6. Why should the Apostle so repeatedly repudiate the imputation that he sought glory of men? He was one of those who instinctively know the impression produced by his character and conduct on the hearts of others. What was the motive of this

our exhortation was not of deceit, nor of uncleanness, nor
 4 in guile: but as we were approved* of God to be put in
 trust with the gospel, even so we speak; not as pleasing
 5 men, but God which proveth* our hearts. For neither
 at any time used we flattering words, as ye know, nor a
 6 cloke of covetousness; God is witness: nor of men
 sought we glory, neither of you, nor of others, when we
 might have been burdensome, as the apostles of Christ.

"vain babbler" would be a common topic of conversation in the cities at which he preached. "To get money, to make himself somebody," would be the ordinary solution. Against this the Apostle protests. His whole life and conversation were a disproof of it. It may have been that he was aware also of something in his manner which might have suggested such a thought. It was not good for him to glory, and yet he sometimes "spake as a fool." Rightly understood this glorying was but an elevation of the soul to God and Christ, or at worst the assertion of himself, in moments of depression or ill-treatment, but to others he might have been conscious that it must have seemed a weakness, and may have been made a ground of the imputation of his adversaries.

The words *δυνάμενοι ἐν βάρει εἶναι* have been referred in different senses either to what precedes, or to what follows. In the first case the sense would be, although we might have been oppressive to you with our glorying and claims. But even though the words be thus humoured in the translation, the antithesis is not quite sound. Without wholly losing sight of what has preceded,

it is better to connect them with what follows. The Apostle means to say that he might have oppressed them with Apostolical claims and pretensions. He might have commanded where he entreated; he might have "come to them with a rod," and he came to them "in love, and in the spirit of meekness" (1 Cor. iv. 21.); he might have claimed the right of support from them as an Apostle of Christ, and he waives it for their sake. Compare 1 Cor. ix. It is true that this last point is not referred to until after an interval of two verses, in ver. 9. But nothing is more in the Apostle's manner than to drop a thought and resume it; and the words *ἐν βάρει εἶναι* repeated in the *ἐπιβαρῆσαι* of v. 9. afford a sufficient indication of what was in his mind. And the existence of the allusion is further confirmed by the use of the same or similar expressions, in reference to the same circumstance of his waiving his right to support. So, *ἐπιβαρῆναι*, 2 Thess. iii. 8.; *καταβαρῆναι*, 2 Cor. xii. 16.; compare *ἀεσπῶ ἐμὲν ὑμῖν ἐρήνησα*, in 2 Cor. xi. 9.

7. But we were not what we might have been while among you, but were gentle, or were

μέσω ὑμῶν, ὡς ἐὰν¹ τροφὸς θάλπη τὰ ἑαυτῆς τέκνα, οὕτως⁸
 ὁμειρόμενοι² ὑμῶν εὐδοκοῦμεν μεταδοῦναι ὑμῖν οὐ μόνον τὸ
 εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς ἑαυτῶν ψυχάς, διότι
 ἀγαπητοὶ ἡμῖν ἐγενήθητε.³ μνημονεύετε γάρ, ἀδελφοί, τὸν⁹
 κόπον ἡμῶν καὶ τὸν μόχθον· νυκτὸς⁴ καὶ ἡμέρας ἐργαζό-
 μενοι, πρὸς τὸ μὴ ἐπιβαρῆσαί τινα ὑμῶν, ἐκηρύξαμεν εἰς
 ὑμᾶς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ. ὑμεῖς μάρτυρες καὶ ὁ θεός,¹⁰
 ὡς ὁσίως καὶ δικαίως καὶ ἀμέμπτως ὑμῖν τοῖς πιστεύουσιν

¹ ἕν.² ὁμειρόμενοι.³ γεγένησθε.⁴ Add γάρ.

children, as a nursing mother with her own children. As in Gal. iv. 19. the Apostle represents himself under the image of a mother, as below, v. 11., and 1 Cor. iv. 15. under that of a father.

Lachmann's reading *νήπιοι* may perhaps have arisen out of the preceding *ἐνεγέθημεν*. It is supported, however, by a preponderance of authorities, the confusion which it appears to occasion in the image, being rather in favour of its genuineness than the reverse, as such confusions occur elsewhere. Compare *κλέπτῃς* and *κλέπτας*, v. 2. 4.; *πρόσωπον* and *προσώπῳ*, in ii. 17. The Apostle would say — "To children I became as a child."

8. οὕτως ὁμειρόμενοι = ὁμειρόμενοι, of which, though a very ancient reading existing in all the uncial manuscripts, it is probably a pseudo-form, supported perhaps by an imaginary derivation from *ὁμοῦ* and *εἶρειν*.

τὰς ἑαυτῶν ψυχάς is by some regarded as a Hebraism for *ἑαυτοὺς*. It is better referred to the willingness of the Apostle to lay down his own life for them,

μεταδοῦναι referring, though not with equal propriety, to both the words which follow it.

9. *νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας* : continually.

The question arises in this verse, how the statement of St. Paul's working with his own hands, agrees with the narrative of the Acts, according to which he remained at Thessalonica but three weeks. We cannot meet the difficulty by saying that, though he preached in the synagogue only during three Sabbath days, yet that his stay may have been much longer, because the spirit of the narrative implies that, after a short stay there, the unbelieving Jews drove him forth. If we regard the general character of this portion of the Acts to be inaccurate, we may say that its author was not acquainted with the real circumstances of St. Paul's stay at Thessalonica. If, on the other hand, we consider its minuteness as a guarantee for its accuracy, we may suppose the Apostle to have commenced his intended course of life at Thessalonica, and that it was suddenly interrupted by the stirring up of persecution.

7 But we were ¹ babes among you, even as a nurse che-
 8 risheth her own* children: so being affectionately de-
 sirous of you, we are willing to have imparted unto
 9 you, not the gospel of God only, but also our own souls,
 because ye were dear unto us. For ye remember,
 brethren, our labour and travail:² labouring night and
 10 day, because we would not be burdensome* unto any of
 you, we preached unto you the gospel of God. Ye are
 witnesses, and God also, how holily and righteously* and
 unblameably we behaved ourselves among you that be-

¹ Gentle.

² Add for.

It throws a singular light on the life of St. Paul, which reflects itself in some degree on the early Church, to observe that his labours as a preacher of the Gospel were not the sole business which engaged him, but were added to his daily occupation. Such, at least, we know to have been his custom at Corinth, at Thessalonica, at Ephesus, and probably elsewhere. Of the twelve hours of the day, perhaps not more than one, of the seven days of the week, perhaps only the Sabbath, was devoted to the exercise of his spiritual calling. It is natural to ask, what motive could have led him, a man of station and education, unused to toil, brought up in the school of a Rabbi, at an age when the bodily frame refuses to perform any new office, to submit himself to manual labour? Was it that he desired to set the example of Christian life, as well as to teach Christian doctrine, to show that there was no opposition between the Gospel and the daily course of the world? Or may it have been to identify himself with the poorer members of his flock?

or to provide for their necessities? or as a religious exercise to keep under his body, and bring it into subjection? or to distinguish himself from the strolling soothsayers who wandered over Greece and Asia, "telling some new thing"? or to draw a line between himself and the Judaizing teachers? or from necessity, or, as we should say, to preserve his independence? Whatever higher motives led the Apostle to toil for his bread, the last-mentioned one falls in with that peculiar sensitiveness respecting the charge of receiving money, which is traceable in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, both in reference to himself and Titus receiving support from the Church, as in reference to the collections for the saints. In the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians, iii. 4., another motive is also indicated, the desire to set an example to his converts. A third motive, that of charity, is mentioned in the discourse to the elders of the Church of Ephesus. (Acts, xx. 34.)

10. ὡς ὁσίως καὶ δικαίως, not how religiously towards God

ἐγενήθημεν, καθάπερ οἶδατε, ὡς ἓνα ἕκαστον ὑμῶν ὡς πατὴρ τέκνα ἑαυτοῦ παρακαλοῦντες ὑμᾶς καὶ παραμυθούμενοι καὶ μαρτυρούμενοι εἰς τὸ περιπατεῖν¹ ὑμᾶς ἀξίως τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ καλοῦντος ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ βασιλείαν καὶ δόξαν.

Καὶ διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἡμεῖς εὐχαριστοῦμεν τῷ θεῷ ἀδιαλείπτως, ὅτι παραλαβόντες λόγον ἀκοῆς παρ' ἡμῶν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐδέξασθε οὐ λόγον ἀνθρώπων ἀλλὰ καθὼς ἔστιν ἀληθῶς λόγον θεοῦ, ὃς καὶ ἐνεργεῖται ἐν ὑμῖν τοῖς πιστεύουσιν. ὑμεῖς γὰρ μιμηταὶ ἐγενήθητε, ἀδελφοί, τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν τοῦ θεοῦ τῶν οὐσῶν ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ ἐν χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, ὅτι τὰ αὐτὰ² ἐπάθετε καὶ ὑμεῖς ὑπὸ τῶν ἰδίων συμφυλετῶν, καθὼς καὶ αὐτοὶ ὑπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων τῶν καὶ τὸν κύριον ἀποκτεινάντων Ἰησοῦν καὶ τοὺς³ προφήτας, καὶ ἡμᾶς ἐκ-

¹ περιπατῆσαι.² ταῦτά.³ Ἀδδ ἰδίους.

and justly towards men, but how holily and righteously. Like our word "righteousness," δικαίως implies not only a moral or legal, but a religious idea.

τοῖς πιστεύουσιν is without emphasis. It would be absurd to suppose that the Apostle means to say that he was not thus irreproachable to unbelievers, and an over-refinement to maintain that he specially commends himself to the judgment of believers as such. Yet the introduction of the pointless word may have arisen from the desire to reciprocate, that is, to speak in praise of them as well as of himself.

11. is an expansion of the preceding. From the general the Apostle passes on to the particular. As if he had said—"I appeal to you individually for the truth of this."—"Each one I consoled and comforted as though I

had been a father with his children." Compare *περὶ πάντων ὑμῶν*, i. 2.

For the construction of this and the succeeding verse, we must supply *ἐγενήθημεν*, which may be equally connected with the adverb or with the participle. Or the second *ὡς* may be regarded as arising out of the first, which has been repeated from the fear of weakening the emphasis of the sentence.

τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ καλοῦντος.] Here, as elsewhere, the "calling" is ascribed, not to Christ, but to God. To him belongs the beginning of the work of salvation.

δόξαν.] Compare Romans, iii. 23., v. 2.

13. καὶ διὰ τοῦτο.] For this cause, and because of all this, because God thus enabled us to preach to you, we give him thanks without ceasing. The clause which follows is a further expla-

- 11 lieve: as ye know how we exhorted and comforted and
 12 charged every one of you, as a father doth his children,
 that ye would walk worthy of God, who calleth* you
 unto his kingdom and glory.
 13 And for this cause we* also thank God without ceas-
 ing, because, when ye received the word of God which
 ye heard of us, ye received it not as the word of men,
 but as it is in truth, the word of God, which effectually
 14 worketh also in you that believe. For ye, brethren, be-
 came followers of the churches of God which in Judæa
 are in Christ Jesus: for ye also have suffered like things
 of your own countrymen, even as they have of the
 15 Jews: who both killed the Lord Jesus, and the prophets¹,

¹ Their own prophets.

nation of why the Apostle was thankful, *διὰ τοῦτο* referring to the verses both before and after. What had been at first the ground, now becomes the subject matter of thankfulness. It is true that it would be tautology to say:—“Because I preached to you with success, I give thanks because ye received my preaching.” But a very slight change of phrase, or difference in point of view, is sufficient to expand the second *ὅτι* into a new reason. There are, in fact, two grounds of thankfulness, although so closely connected together as to be inseparable:—First, his success in preaching; secondly, their reception of it in the true conviction that it was the word of God.

λόγον Θεοῦ.] As the Divine word: not the word which tells of God, but the word of which God is the author.

ὅς καὶ ἐνεργεῖται.] Which proves

itself by its operation in you who believe it.

14. The object of the parallel which follows, is not to meet the objection that might be made against the Gospel, that the Jews who were its natural adherents, rejected it, still less to warn the Thessalonians against Judaizing teachers. It was a thought that arose naturally in the Apostle's mind as he recollected the persecutions which the Thessalonians had endured at the hand of the heathen rulers, and these too, as we learn from the Acts, set on to them by the Jews. Reduced to its simplest form, the train of ideas is:—“The word of God showed its power in you, for it enabled you to endure persecution.” But this latter change is expanded by the Apostle into:—“For ye, brethren, followed the example of the Churches in Judea (such, at least, was the result),

διωξάντων, καὶ θεῷ μὴ ἀρεσκόντων καὶ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις ἐναντίων, κωλύοντων ἡμᾶς τοῖς ἔθνεσιν λαλῆσαι ἵνα 16 σωθῶσιν, εἰς τὸ ἀναπληρῶσαι αὐτῶν τὰς ἀμαρτίας πάντοτε. ἔφθακεν¹ δὲ ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ἡ ὀργὴ εἰς τέλος.

¹ ἐφθασεν.

and have suffered from your countrymen, what they have from theirs."

15. Who, as they persecuted you, also slew the Lord Jesus, and the prophets; and going on in the same course, persecuted us, and are the enemies of God and man.

τὸν κύριον Ἰησοῦν, *the Lord Jesus.*] Him whom they were bound to serve. The word κύριος seems to be added, partly to express the reverential feeling of the Apostle, partly also to heighten their guilt.

τοὺς προφῆτας.] Compare St. Stephen's speech, Acts, vii. 52.; and our Lord's, Matt. xxiii. 31. 37.

For the feelings which the Apostle entertained towards his countrymen at a later period, compare Rom. x. 1:—"Brethren, my heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel is, that they may be saved." Yet, both states of feeling may have existed together; the one on the surface, called forth by passing events; the other in his "heart of hearts," deep and silent.

Wherever the Apostle had gone on his second journey, he had been persecuted by the Jews; and the longer he travelled about among Gentile cities, the more he must have been sensible of the feeling with which his countrymen were regarded. Isolated as they were from the rest of the

world in every city, a people within a people, it was impossible that they should not be united for their own self-defence, and regarded with suspicion by the rest of mankind. But their inner nature was not less repugnant to the nobler, as well as the baser feelings of Greece and Rome. Their fierce nationality had outlived itself; though worshippers of the true God, they knew him not to be the God of all nations of the earth; hated and despised by others, they could but cherish in return an impotent contempt and hatred of other men. What wonder that, for an instant, the Apostle should have felt that this Gentile feeling was not wholly groundless? or that he should use words which recall the expression of Tacitus: "Adversus omnes alios hostile odium"?—Hist. v. 5.

16. It has been urged that κωλύοντων, having no copulative conjunction, must be connected with ἐναντίων, which mode of taking the words is supposed to soften the language of St. Paul towards his countrymen, by confining it to those who had opposed the Gospel; "the enemies of God and man in that they hinder us," &c. Such a mode of construction is unnatural, and ill-suited to the impassioned style of the passage. As in the expression of Tacitus, the words are general and not limited by

and chased us* out by persecution ; and they please not
 16 God, and are contrary to all men : forbidding us to
 speak to the Gentiles that they might be saved, to fill
 up their sins alway. But the wrath has¹ come upon
 them to the uttermost.

¹ Is.

the particular case of their hindrance to the Apostle's mission. Compare for a similar feeling St. Stephen's speech, Acts, vii. 52. ; and our Lord's, Matt. xxiii. 31. 37.

16. It has been maintained that this verse must have been written after the destruction of Jerusalem. (See Introductory Essay, on the Genuineness of the Epistle.) Had it been so, not only would allusions to the destruction of Jerusalem have, probably, appeared elsewhere in the Epistle, but this very passage would have spoken more plainly. In all ages, without the gift of prophesy men have been prone to read the signs of evil in the world. There was enough in the outward state of the Jewish people, as we read the narrative of it in Josephus, or in the impenitency and obstinacy of the Jewish nature, as it revealed itself to the Apostle from within, to be the shadow of events to come. Yet the language of the Apostle seems to indicate, not that they were actually suffering or to suffer punishment, but only that they had reached that final point of reprobation from whence there is no more a way back.

The spiritual interest of the Apostle about his converts, is never for a moment separate from his human tender love for them. Whether the circumstances of the

Church and the world admit of our drawing such a distinction now or not, it was unknown to those times when the believers were a family of love. What the Apostle felt was not a general case of the Churches which he had to govern, but a private personal individual love for each one. And this not weakened by absence, or changing as he moved from place to place ; but mindful at Corinth of those who are at Thessalonica and Rome ; at Rome, of those in Asia.

εις το expresses, not the object, but the object and the result blended together in one ; the natural event, as the Apostle regards it, in the order of Providence.

ἀναπληρῶσαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας,
to fill up their sins.] Compare Genesis, xv. 16. : — “ For the iniquity of the Amorites is not yet full.” In the beginning of sin and evil it seems as if men were free agents, and had the power of going on or of retreating. But as the crisis of their fate approaches, they are bound under a curse ; and the form in which their destiny presents itself to our minds, is as though it were certain, and only a question of time, how soon it is to be fulfilled. We look at them from without, and watch the double necessity in themselves, and in the course of events which is meeting in one.

Ἡμεῖς δέ, ἀδελφοί, ἀπορφανισθέντες ἀφ' ὑμῶν πρὸς 17
 καιρὸν ὥρας προσώπῳ οὐ καρδίᾳ, περισσοτέρως ἐσπου-
 δάσαμεν τὸ πρόσωπον ὑμῶν ἰδεῖν ἐν πολλῇ ἐπιθυμίᾳ,
 διότι¹ ἠθελήσαμεν ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς, ἐγὼ μὲν Παῦλος καὶ 18
 ἄπαξ καὶ δῖς, καὶ ἐνέκοψεν ἡμᾶς ὁ σατανᾶς. τίς γὰρ ἡμῶν 19
 ἐλπίς ἢ χαρὰ ἢ στέφανος καυχήσεως, ἢ οὐχὶ καὶ ὑμεῖς,
 ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ² ἐν τῇ αὐτοῦ παρουσίᾳ;
 ὑμεῖς γάρ ἐστε ἡ δόξα ἡμῶν καὶ ἡ χαρά. διὸ μηκέτι 20
 3

¹ *ιδί.*² *Add χριστοῦ.*

This feeling often recurs both in the Old and New Testament, as in this passage, Paul thinks of the Jews as hardened in their impenitence; the cup was filling, their opposition to the Gospel was the last drop which made it run over. πάντοτε, before Christ, at the time of Christ, after Christ.

ἐφθακεν δὲ ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ἡ ὀργή.] ἡ ὀργή, either the long-expected wrath, or the wrath consequent upon their sins. ἐφθακεν has come upon, or reached them, without the classical sense of anticipation, as elsewhere in the New Testament, and everywhere in modern Greek. εἰς τέλος, either "continually," so as never to cease, or "utterly," so as finally to make an end. Compare Job, xx. 7.; Jos. viii. 24.

ἡμεῖς δέ, *but we.*] Is a resumption, after a pause, of verse 13.

ἀπορφανισθέντες.] Bereaved in being separated from you.

πρὸς καιρὸν ὥρας.] For a brief moment, for the time of an hour.

προσώπῳ οὐ καρδίᾳ.] Though absent in body, yet present in soul. Compare 2 Cor. v. 12.

περισσοτέρως ἐσπουδάσαμεν, *were the more earnest.*] With καιρὸν ὥρας, in reference to the very shortness of his absence

from them; "we are so much the more desirous to see your face, as we are not yet used to miss you."

τὸ πρόσωπον ὑμῶν] instead of ὑμᾶς, in allusion to προσώπῳ, which precedes:—"We wanted to see you face to face, which is the only way in which we were separated from you."

18. διότι. Because of which great desire we desired to come to you.

ἐγὼ μὲν Παῦλος] is emphatic, ἐγὼ μὲν being added with Παῦλος, to draw attention to himself, not necessarily to distinguish his earnest wish from that of Timothy and Silas, who might be supposed to be joined with him in ἠθελήσαμεν. The idiom did not admit ἡμεῖς μὲν Παῦλος. Compare 2 Cor. x. 1.

ὁ σατανᾶς.] It is not certain what the Apostle means by these words; perhaps some obstruction, which seemed to be thrown in his way in preaching the Gospel, such as the persecution of the Jews of Thessalonica. More probably, however, he refers to some inward impediment, analogous to that which he experienced when "they assayed to preach the word in Asia;

- 17 BUT we, brethren, being bereaved* in being taken
 from you for a short time in presence, not in heart,
 18 were the more abundantly* earnest to see your face with
 great desire. Wherefore we would have come unto
 19 you, even I Paul, once and again; but Satan hindered
 us. For what is our hope, or joy, or crown of rejoicing?
 Are not even ye in the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ
 20 at his coming? For ye are our glory and joy. Where-

howbeit, the Spirit suffered them not."—Acts, xvi. We have no other means of judging what was the nature of the hindrance, but from the probable meaning of an expression which is in itself uncertain.

19. For you are our hope and joy and crown of glory in the day of judgment. As the Apostle says elsewhere:—"Who is weak, and I am not weak?" or, in other words, who feels, and I do not feel with him? So in this passage their hope is his hope, their joy is his joy; they are his crown of glory at the last day.

ἐμπροσθεν τοῦ κυρίου.] He thinks of them as of all other men, as before the Lord in the presence of Christ; and thinking of Christ, he looks forward to his appearing as already present. Compare note, Romans, ii. 16.

20. *ὑμεῖς γὰρ ἔστε ἡ δόξα ἡμῶν καὶ ἡ χαρά.*] Yes, he repeats with earnestness, for ye are our glory and our joy.

The first verses of the third chapter are connected with the seventeenth verse of the preceding; as elsewhere (compare v. 13. of the second chapter) in the writings of St. Paul, the connecting particle refers to the whole previous subject, and serves to

recall the reader's mind from a partial digression. Even little things have an interest for those whom we love, and accordingly the Apostle dwells minutely on the circumstance of his affection for them. He could no longer contain himself, and therefore sent Timotheus to inquire about their faith (the very pleonasm of the expressions, *τὸν ἀδελφὸν καὶ συνεργὸν τοῦ θεοῦ* *στηρίξαι καὶ παρακαλέσαι*, bear a trace of the style of St. Paul). They were in persecution; but that, they knew themselves, was their appointed lot; he had told them of it, and they had the witness of it in themselves. Then repeating and carrying on the thought of v. 1.:—"Therefore he had sent Timothy," to know whether they were firm, or whether they had fallen before the tempter. And now Timothy had brought him the good news of their faith and love, and of their feelings to him, which are the very reflection of his to them, he is full of comfort, and seems to receive a new life in his own trials, at the thought of their constancy. How can he thank God enough for the joy which he feels for them in the presence of God, which mingles

στέγοντες εὐδοκήσαμεν καταλειφθῆναι ἐν Ἀθήναις μόνοι, καὶ ἐπέμψαμεν Τιμόθεον, τὸν ἀδελφὸν ἡμῶν¹ καὶ συνεργὸν² τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ τοῦ χριστοῦ, εἰς τὸ στηρίξαι ὑμᾶς καὶ παρακαλέσαι³ ὑπὲρ τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν τὸ³ μηδένα³ σαίνεισθαι ἐν ταῖς θλίψεσιν ταύταις· αὐτοὶ γὰρ οἶδατε ὅτι εἰς τοῦτο κείμεθα· καὶ γὰρ ὅτε πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἦμεν,⁴ προελέγομεν ὑμῖν ὅτι μέλλομεν θλίβεσθαι, καθὼς καὶ ἐγένετο καὶ οἶδατε. διὰ τοῦτο ἀγῶ μηκέτι στέγων ἐπεμψα⁵

¹ καὶ διάκονον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ συνεργὸν ἡμῶν.² περὶ.³ τῷ.

still with the never ceasing longing to see their face and confirm their faith? And then, separating his wish into two parts, he trusts that God may guide his feet towards them; and that whether this is accomplished for him or not, he may make them feel the same love to one another and towards all men, that he does for them, and stablish their hearts before him in that which is coming and now is, the appearing of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Compare the return of Titus, in 2 Cor. ii. 13.; the desire to see the Romans, in i. 10.; the sending of Tychicus, in Ephes. vi. 21.; the coming of Epaphroditus, in Philipp. iv. 18.

III. διὸ refers to the general sense of the preceding verses. Wherefore, i. e. from our great affection for you.

μηκέτι.] The μή may be explained as giving a subjective turn to the meaning. "Wherefore, feeling that we could," or "as those who could no longer."

στέγοντες, containing ourselves.] στέγειν has the two meanings of holding out and in. εὐδοκήσαμεν, we determined, our good pleasure was.

καταλειφθῆναι, κ. τ. λ., to be left, &c.] It may be remarked, that these words half agree with the Acts, and half with the Epistle. For they certainly imply that the Apostle was left without companions, and yet there is no mention of his sending away Silas, who was with him at the time of his writing the Epistle, but only Timothy.

Admitting the genuineness of the Epistle, and the confirmation afforded by it to many of the statements of the Acts, we are naturally led to speculate by what arrangement of events the error may be made smallest.

Suppose Silas only to have been left in Macedonia, with a charge to join Paul shortly; Paul, impatient to hear of his new converts, sends Timothy from Athens, who returns with Silas. The only incorrectness then in the narrative of the Acts arises from the ignorance of the writer, that Timothy was not left behind. The account of the Epistle, that Paul was left alone at Athens, although he only sent away Timothy and although Silas and Timothy were with him shortly afterwards, as well as the tone of the Acts, respecting

fore when we could no longer forbear, we thought it
 2 good to be left at Athens alone; and sent Timotheus,
 our brother, and fellow-worker with God¹, in the
 gospel of Christ, to establish you, and to comfort you
 3 concerning your faith, that no man should be moved
 by these tribulations; for yourselves know that we are
 4 appointed thereunto, for verily, when we were with
 you, we told you before that we should suffer tribula-
 5 tion; even as it came to pass, and ye know. For this

¹ Minister of God and our fellow-labourer.

Paul's eagerness, that Silas and Timothy should follow him, agrees with this hypothesis. See the fuller discussion of the question in note on Paley's *Horæ Paulinæ*.

2. *συνεργὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, fellow-worker.*] Not the fellow-worker with us in the service of God, but the fellow-worker with God. Compare 1 Cor. iii. 9. *θεοῦ γὰρ ἔσμεν συνεργοί*. As in other places the Apostle introduces his "true yoke-fellows" with titles of honour; not, however, as some of the Fathers imagine, to express the extent of the sacrifice he is making for their good, in sending away so valued a helpmate as Timothy.

ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ.] In preaching the Gospel.

εἰς τὸ στηρίξαι.] That he may strengthen you.

παρακαλέσαι.] Either to comfort, or exhort. In this passage the latter meaning seems to agree better with ver. 3. Compare the use of *ὑπὲρ* in 2 Thess. ii. 1.

ὑπὲρ τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν.] To preserve your faith.

3. *τὸ μηδένα σάινεσθαι.*] The MSS. are almost equally divided between *τὸ* and *τῷ*: the first we

may explain by the grammatical fiction of *κατὰ*, understood that is as the remoter object of *ἐπέμψαμεν*, or *epexegetis*. Compare, *παρακαλέσαι ὑπὲρ τῆς πίστεως*. The second, if explainable at all, may be considered as a Greek translation of the Hebrew dative. *σαίνεσθαι*, though connected with *σείεσθαι*, not simply moved, but rather moved to softness. Compare Soph. Ant. 1214., *παίδός με σαίνει φθόγγος*.

ἐν ταῖς θλίψεσι τάνταις: i. e. the persecutions which they and the Apostle alike endured.

αὐτοὶ γὰρ οἶδατε.] Not merely because the Apostle had foretold it, as he says in the following verse, but because all Christians must have felt the state of persecution natural to them. *γὰρ* supplies the reason why they ought not to faint; viz., that persecution was not a thing unexpected, but the very appointment of God respecting them.

εἰς τοῦτο refers to *θλίψουσιν*.] For a similar lax relation of two words compare Rom. xiii. 6.

4. "For we told you beforehand, not of any particular trouble, but that we *are* to be persecuted, as

εἰς τὸ γινῶναι τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν, μή πως ἐπείρασεν ὑμᾶς ὁ
πειράζων καὶ εἰς κενὸν γένηται ὁ κόπος ἡμῶν. ἄρτι δὲ ⁶
ἐλθόντος Τιμοθέου πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἀφ' ὑμῶν καὶ εὐαγγελισα-
μένου ἡμῖν τὴν πίστιν καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην ὑμῶν, καὶ ὅτι ἔχετε
μνησίαν ἡμῶν ἀγαθὴν πάντοτε ἐπιποθοῦντες ἡμᾶς ἰδεῖν
καθάπερ καὶ ἡμεῖς ὑμᾶς, διὰ τοῦτο παρεκλήθημεν, ἀδελφοί, ⁷
ἐφ' ὑμῖν ἐπὶ πάσῃ τῇ ἀνάγκῃ καὶ θλίψει ¹ ἡμῶν διὰ τῆς
ὑμῶν πίστεως, ὅτι νῦν ζῶμεν ἐὰν ὑμεῖς στήκητε ἐν κυρίῳ. ⁸
τίνα γὰρ εὐχαριστίαν δυνάμεθα τῷ θεῷ ἀνταποδοῦναι περὶ ⁹
ὑμῶν ἐπὶ πάσῃ τῇ χαρᾷ ἣ χαίρομεν δι' ὑμᾶς ἔμπροσθεν
τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν, νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ δεό- ¹⁰
μενοι εἰς τὸ ἰδεῖν ὑμῶν τὸ πρόσωπον καὶ καταρτίσαι τὰ

¹ θλίψει καὶ ἀνάγκῃ.

has come to pass, and ye know of your own experience." The plural μέλλομεν identifies the Apostle and his converts with believers everywhere.

5. For this special reason (in addition to the general love and regard I bear for you), feeling that I could no longer contain myself, I sent to know your faith, lest in time of persecution the tempter should have tempted you, and as a consequence, our labour should have been in vain. As though the Apostle had said:—"And this made me anxious to know about you, and I could endure the suspense no longer, so I sent." *καγὼ*, I also on my part; in contradistinction to the Thessalonians, of whom he had been speaking in the previous clause. Compare *καὶ ἡμεῖς*, ii. 13. *μή πως* is connected with *γινῶναι*, and implies an expansion of the preceding thought.

ὁ πειράζων, *the tempter*.] As in 1 Cor. vii. 5.: *μή πειράζῃ ὑμᾶς ὁ σατανᾶς*. Compare Matt.

iv. 3. The tempter, as of Christ, so of his followers.

6. *ἄρτι δέ, but now*,] is to be taken with *διὰ τοῦτο*; *παρεκλήθημεν* in the next verse. "We were anxious about you, and sent Timotheus; but now that Timotheus is returned, and we have good news, we are comforted."

Timotheus came to us and brought good news of your faith and love, and of your remembrance of us, and your having a desire to see us, even as we have to see you.

ἀγαθὴν μνησίαν, a good remembrance.] As with *ἐλπεις, συνειδήσεις, ἡμέρα*. As in the Apostle's view of the relation of the believer to Christ, the great work of salvation is the identity of one with the other, so in the relation of believers to each other, they become one, having the same feelings without distinction of absence or presence; they rejoice, sorrow, are comforted, persecuted, triumph with each other. Moral

cause, when I could no longer forbear, I also sent to know your faith, lest by some means the tempter have
 6 tempted you, and our labour been in vain. But now when Timotheus came from you unto us, and brought us good tidings of your faith and love, and that ye have good remembrance of us always, desiring greatly to see
 7 us, as we also to see you: therefore, brethren, we were comforted over you in all our affliction and distress by
 8 your faith: for now we live, if ye stand fast in the Lord.
 9 For what thanks can we render to God again for you, for all the joy wherewith we joy for your sakes before
 10 our God; night and day praying exceedingly that we might see your face, and might perfect that which is

philosophers have sometimes tried to resolve our moral nature into sympathy; far more nearly true is this of our Christian feelings, which are the communication to many of one spirit.

7. *διὰ τοῦτο.*] Takes up the sentence after the long participial clauses. For this good news.

ἄρτι παρεκλήθημεν, now we are comforted. Implying that the Epistle was written immediately after the return of Timothy.

ἐφ' ὑμῖν.] In reference to you.

ἐπὶ πάσῃ τῇ ἀνάγκῃ καὶ θλίψει ἡμῶν.] In ver. 3. the Apostle spoke of a tribulation, which he had in common with the Thessalonians. That was not taken away, but only alleviated by the news of Timothy. To this he is here alluding, and not to his anxiety respecting the Thessalonians. "In all my trial and persecution I am comforted by your faith."

8. *ὅτι νῦν ζῶμεν,* for now we live.] The Apostle regards his affliction as a sort of death, from

which he was roused to life by the news of his converts. Compare 2 Cor. i. 8—11.

νῦν refers to the change of of feeling occasioned by the arrival of Timothy. When he thought of the persecutions that surrounded him, and the possibility of the falling off from the faith, he was as one "having the sentence of death in himself;" but now in their life he lives.

9. *γάρ.*] For we thank God, that you do stand, *γάρ* expressing the reason of what has gone before. This the Apostle implies in the question, "For how can we thank God for you all, for all the joy with which we joy on your account in the presence of our God?"

10. *δεόμενοι*] is not to be joined with *χαίρομεν*, but arises out of the idea of his love for them, expressed in the preceding verse. The Apostle lives in his converts, he rejoices in their joy, he exults before God to think of them. Only with this mingles the hu-

ὑστερήματα τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν ; αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ 11
 ἡμῶν καὶ ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς κατευθύνει τὴν ὁδὸν ἡμῶν
 πρὸς ὑμᾶς. ὑμᾶς δὲ ὁ κύριος πλεονάσαι καὶ περισσεύσαι 12
 τῇ ἀγάπῃ εἰς ἀλλήλους καὶ εἰς πάντας, καθάπερ καὶ ἡμεῖς
 εἰς ὑμᾶς, εἰς τὸ στηρίζαι ὑμῶν τὰς καρδίας ἀμέμπτους ἐν 13

man feeling of a desire to see them again.

ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ.] Not as a work of supererogation, but only exceedingly.

καταρτίσαι τὰ ὑστερήματα.] To fill up what was wanting. Compare Rom. i. 11. Nothing can be inferred from this, either one way or the other, on the duration of the Thessalonian community. The Apostle may or may not be referring to those special deficiencies of the Thessalonian Church which he has elsewhere indicated, their error about the dead, or their disorder.

αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ θεός, now God Himself.] May God himself guide me to you! αὐτὸς is said in opposition to the Apostle's going there of himself, and the hindrances of Satan, which he had spoken of before. The thought of the Apostle rises naturally to God, who can do all things; who, though he now seems cut off from them, can guide his way to them.

12. But whether he grant me this request or not, may he make you to abound and increase in love. The Apostle has availed himself, however, of the transitive as well as intransitive sense of the two verbs, to give the thought another turn. "But may the Lord make you to abound and exceed in love to one another, and towards all, even as we do

abound and exceed in love to you."

εἰς ἀλλήλους.] To one another your brother members of the Church.

εἰς πάντας.] To mankind in general.

13. εἰς τὸ στηρίζαι] may be either taken as the end of what preceded, "May the Lord fulfil you with love to one another, to the end that he may establish you in holiness," with which can be compared such passages as "love is the fulfilling of the law." εἰς τὸ στηρίζαι may belong to the form rather than to the meaning of the sentence. In other words, the Apostle with equal logical sequence might have said, "May the Lord make you to abound in grace, to establish your hearts," or "May God make you to abound in grace, so as to establish your hearts."

ἀμέμπτους] is best taken with ἐν ἀγιωσύνῃ: an allusion to which latter word is contained in μετὰ πάντων τῶν ἀγίων.

To what extent did the first Christians suffer persecution? Much has been said of the tolerant spirit of the Roman government inclined to let all religions sleep peacefully under the shadow of its wings. But it is one thing to tolerate existing religions, another to sanction a new one, and that too not seeking to insinuate itself privately, but openly professing as its object the conversion

- 11 lacking in your faith? " Now our God and Father
himself, and our Lord Jesus Christ direct our way
12 unto you. And the Lord make you to increase and
abound in love one toward another, and toward all men,
13 even as we do toward you: to the end he may stablish

of the world. Probably there has never been a civilised country in which such an attempt at proselytism would not have been at first met by persecution. Every page of the Acts of the Apostles is a picture of similar persecutions. And more remarkable than any part of the Acts is that narrative which St. Paul himself gives us of his own sufferings (2 Cor. xi. 23—33.), and which, amid many other reflections, suggests the thought, how small a part of his life has been preserved to us.

From the state of Christianity in the time of Pliny or Tacitus, we can scarcely form an idea of its first difficulties. Everywhere it had to encounter the fierce spirit of fanaticism, wrought up in the Jew to its highest pitch, in the pagan just needing to be awakened. The Jews, the false brethren, the heretics, the heathen, were in league more or less openly, at one time or other, for its destruction. All ages which have witnessed a revival of religious feeling, have witnessed also the outbreak of religious passions; the pure light of the one becomes the spark by which the other is kindled. Reasons of state sometimes create a faint and distant suspicion of a new faith; the feelings of the mass rise to overwhelm it.

The Roman government may be said to have observed in gene-

ral the same line respecting the first preachers of the Gospel, as would be observed in modern times; that is to say, of matters of faith and opinion, as such, they hardly took account, except in so far as they endangered the safety of the government, or led to breaches of the public peace. It seemed idle to them to dispute about questions of the Jewish law in Roman courts of justice; but they were not the less prepared to call to account those by whose supposed agency a whole city was in an uproar. Hence, when the really peaceable character of the Gospel was seen, the persecutions gradually ceased and revived only at a later period, when Christianity itself became a political power.

Allowing for the difference of times and seasons, the feelings of the Roman governors were not altogether unlike those with which the followers of John Wesley, in the last century, might have been regarded by the magistrates of an English town. And making still greater allowance for the malignity and depth of the passions by which men were agitated as the old religions were breaking up, a parallel not less just might be drawn also between the feelings of the multitude. There was in both cases a kind of sympathy by which the lower class were attracted towards the new teachers. Natural feel-

ἀγιοσύνη ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρός ἡμῶν ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ¹ μετὰ πάντων τῶν ἀγίων αὐτοῦ. [ἀμήν.]

¹ Add *χριστοῦ*.

ing suggested that these men had come for their good; they were grateful for the love shown of them, and for the ministration to their temporal wants. There was a time when it was said of the first believers, that they were in favour with all the people (Acts, ii. 47.), and that "all men glorified God for that which was done" (iv. 21.). But at the preaching of Stephen the scene changes; the deep irreconcilable hostility of the two principles is beginning to be felt; "it is not peace, but a sword;" not "I am come to fulfil the law," but "not one stone shall be left upon another."

The moment this was clearly perceived, not only would the far-sighted jealousy of chief priests and rulers be alarmed at the preaching of the Apostles; but the very instincts of the multitude itself would rise at them. More than anything that we have witnessed in modern times of religious intolerance, would be the feeling against those who sought to relax the bond of circumcision as enemies to their country, their religion, and their God. But there was another aspect of the new religion, which served to bring home these feelings even yet more nearly. It was the disruption of the family. As our Lord foretold, the father was against the son, the son against the father, the mother-in-law against the daughter-in-law, the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law. A new power had arisen in the

world, which seemed to cut across and dis sever natural affections. Consider what is implied in the words "of believing women not a few;" what animosities of parents, and brethren, and husbands! what hatreds, and fears, and jealousies! An unknown tie, closer than that of kindred, drew away the individuals of a family, and joined them to an external society. It was not only that they were members of another Church, or attendants on a separate worship. The difference went beyond this. In the daily intercourse of life, at every meal, the unbelieving brother or sister was conscious of the presence of the unclean. It was an injury not readily to be forgotten, or forgiven its authors, than which in this world none could be greater. The fanatic priest, led on by every personal and religious motive—the man of the world, caring for none of those things, but not the less resenting the intrusion on the peace of his home—the craftsman, fearing for his gains—the accursed multitude, knowing not the law, but irritated at the very notion of this mysterious society of such real though hidden strength—would all work together towards the overthrow of those who seemed to them to be turning upside down the political, religious, and social order of the world.

These considerations, though based only on general principles of human nature, are necessary to

your hearts unblameable in holiness before our God and Father, God, our Father, at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ with all his saints.

make us understand the undercurrent of the Apostolical history, as well as to form a just estimate of the question which we are considering. The actual persecution of the Roman government was slight, but what may be termed the social persecution and the illegal violence employed towards the first disciples unceasing. "Of the Jews five times received I forty stripes save one;" who would know or care what went on in the Jewish quarter of a great city? How precarious must have been their fate who, with the passions of men arrayed against them, had no protection from the law! They were liable to be persecuted by the Jews, to suffer persecution as Jews, to arm the feelings of all nations against themselves as the professors of an unnational religion. Little reflection is necessary to fill up the details of that image of peril, which the Apostle presents to us in all his Epistles. It is the same vision which is again presented to us in the Book of the Revelation, of the common tribulation of St. John and the Churches, of the sufferings that were to come upon the Church of Smyrna, of the faithfulness of Pergamos in the days when the martyr Antipas was slain, of the two witnesses, and of the souls beneath the altar, saying "how long?" It is the same which reappears in the earliest ecclesiastical history, in the narrative of Hegesippus respecting James the Just. Except on some accidental occasion, such as the Neronian

persecution, there is no reason to suppose that the power of Rome was systematically employed against the first disciples of the Apostles. But it does not diminish their sufferings, that they were the result of illegal violence, such as the tumults at Thessalonica, at Ephesus, or at Jerusalem.

Ch. IV. The lesson which the Apostle has to teach the Thessalonians, does not admit of any great variety of statement or particularly of detail. It is a lesson which they have heard before, which they are now practising, and need only to practise more and more, which is summed up in one word—their sanctification; that is to say, first, they are to abstain from fornication; and as a remedy for fornication, every man is to have his own wife. In purity of life they are to be unlike the Gentiles, not to defraud, or invade their brother's right; For of all such offences the Lord is the avenger. God, who called them, called them not to lasciviousness, but to holiness. And, therefore, he who despises this precept, is a despiser, not of man, but of God who sanctifies us by his Holy Spirit; a violator, not of moral duties only, but of the first principle of Christian life.

"But respecting another part of Christian duty, love of the brethren, ye need not that I write to you. For ye yourselves have learned, not of me, but of God, to love one another. For ye not only know, but practise it to all the brethren that are in all Mace-

Λοιπὸν¹ οὖν, ἀδελφοί, ἐρωτῶμεν ὑμᾶς καὶ παρακαλοῦμεν ⁴
 ἐν κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ, ἵνα² καθὼς παρελάβετε παρ' ἡμῶν τὸ
 πῶς δεῖ ὑμᾶς περιπατεῖν καὶ ἀρέσκειν θεῷ, καθὼς καὶ
 περιπατεῖτε³, ἵνα περισσεύητε μᾶλλον. οἴδατε γὰρ τίνας ²
 παραγγελίας ἐδώκαμεν ὑμῖν διὰ τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ. τοῦτο ³
 γάρ ἐστιν [τὸ] θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ, ὁ ἁγιασμός ὑμῶν,
 ἀπέχεσθαι ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ τῆς πορνείας, εἰδέναι ἕκαστον ὑμῶν ⁴
 τὸ ἑαυτοῦ σκευὸς κτᾶσθαι ἐν ἁγιασμῷ καὶ τιμῇ, μὴ ἐν πά- ⁵

¹ τὸ λοιπὸν.² Omit ἵνα.³ Omit καθὼς καὶ περιπατεῖτε.

donia. But though you need not my urging, yet I beg of you to do it more and more, and (once more to repeat a former exhortation) to live in peace, and do your own business, that so ye may set a fair example to the heathen, and be lacking in no spiritual grace.

"But as to those who have been taken from among you, do not let the thought of them be a source of disorder in your lives. In this too I would not have you to be like the heathen, who are without hope. For to us the remembrance of the dead is bound up with the thought of Christ; and as we believe that He died and rose again, so those that are asleep in Christ will God bring with him. For hear the exposition of the whole matter as Christ has revealed it; we who survive at that day, will be after, rather than before the dead. For the Lord will Himself descend from heaven with a shout, and the voice of the archangel and the trump of God. And first the dead in Christ will rise to be gathered to Him, and then we the living shall be caught up to meet the Lord in the air. And so shall we be ever with Him."

1. The MSS. vary between λοι-

πὸν and τὸ λοιπὸν, "furthermore," and "for what remains:" either marks a transition, more or less emphatic, from the personal to the hortatory portion of the Epistle. οὖν connects the verse with the preceding mention of the appearance of Christ, "seeing then these things, we exhort you," &c.

ἐρωτῶμεν] which in classical Greek means only to ask questions, has here the signification of request, entreat, as in Acts, x. 48. and elsewhere.

ἐν κυρίῳ.] Compare the note at i. 2. on this and similar expressions. St. Paul exhorts and prays them, as he does everything, in their common Lord in whom he and they are united in one spirit. "We beseech you that, as ye have received from us, how ye ought to walk and please God, or by what manner of walk ye should please God as ye do walk, so ye may do more and more."

καὶ ἀρέσκειν.] Although it is incorrect to say that καὶ is like the Hebrew וְ taken for *and*, yet the two ideas, περιπατεῖν καὶ ἀρέσκειν θεῷ, closely adhere to each other, and are equivalent to τὸ πῶς περιπατοῦντας δεῖ ὑμᾶς ἀρέσκειν τῷ θεῷ.

ἵνα] is a resumption of the former

4 FURTHERMORE then we beseech you, brethren,
and exhort you by the Lord Jesus, that as ye received
of us how ye ought to walk and to please God, even as
2 ye do walk ¹ that ye would abound more and more. For
ye know what commandments we gave you by the Lord
3 Jesus. For this is the will of God, your sanctifica-
4 tion, that ye should abstain from fornication: that every
one of you should know how to get himself his own
5 vessel in sanctification and honour; not in the lust of

¹ Omit even as ye do walk.

ἵνα: the words καθὼς καὶ περιπατεῖτε ἵνα περισσεύητε μᾶλλον, may be regarded as a complimentary form for οὕτω περιπατήτε.

2. οἴδατε γάρ, *for ye know.*] For ye know what ye did receive from us: the command that we gave you, not of ourselves, but through our Lord Jesus Christ.

3. The Apostle goes on to a further explanation of what the precepts were. "For this that I am about to speak of, is what God wills—your sanctification." This is further defined by the clause:—ἀπέχεσθαι ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ τῆς πορνείας. Compare the decree of the Apostles and brethren at Jerusalem, that the Gentiles should abstain "from fornication and from things strangled and from blood." The reason probably was in both cases the same; the extreme difficulty that there was in heathen cities, in preserving purity of morals among the converts. See note at the end of the chapter.

τὸ ἑαυτοῦ σκεῦος κτᾶσθαι, *to get his own vessel.*] It is doubted whether under the image of a vessel is meant "the body" or "a wife." The meaning of the word κτᾶσθαι, and the opposition

of ἑαυτοῦ to πορνείας, and also to πλεονεκτεῖν τὸν ἀδελφόν, in ver. 6., is decidedly in favour of the latter interpretation. Compare 1 Cor. vii. 2., for a similar opposition, διὰ δὲ τὰς πορνείας ἕκαστος τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα ἔχτω. For the figure, compare 1 Peter, iii. 7. See also parallels in Schöttgen, which prove the common Jewish use of σκεῦος for a wife. The exact force of the whole passage may be expressed as follows:—"This is the will of God—your sanctification:" by this is meant, "your abstaining from fornication, your knowing how to live chastely in a married state." This is opposed to verse 6., the general sense of which is "not to covet another man's wife." Two difficulties occur, however, in the attempt to disentangle the connexion. First, it might seem as if St. Paul was enjoining all men to marry. This, however, is modified by ver. 6. Every man is to have his own wife, rather than to defraud his neighbour. In other words, the precept is not absolute; but relative to the sin of adultery and fornication. The second difficulty is the insertion of μὴ ἐν πάθει ἐπι-

θει ἐπιθυμίας καθάπερ καὶ τὰ ἔθνη τὰ μὴ εἰδότα τὸν θεόν, τὸ μὴ ὑπερβαίνειν καὶ πλεονεκτεῖν ἐν τῷ πράγματι τὸν 6 ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ, διότι ἔκδικος¹ κύριος περὶ πάντων τούτων, καθὼς καὶ προείπαμεν ὑμῖν καὶ διεμαρτυράμεθα. οὐ γὰρ 7 ἐκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς ὁ θεὸς ἐπὶ ἀκαθαρσία, ἀλλ' ἐν ἁγιασμῷ. τοιγαροῦν ὁ ἀθετῶν οὐκ ἄνθρωπον ἀθετεῖ, ἀλλὰ τὸν θεὸν 8 τὸν² δίδοντα αὐτοῦ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον εἰς ὑμᾶς.

Περὶ δὲ τῆς φιλαδελφίας οὐ χρεῖαν³ ἔχομεν γράφειν 9 ὑμῖν· αὐτοὶ γὰρ ὑμεῖς θεοδιδάκτοί ἐστε εἰς τὸ ἀγαπᾶν ἀλλήλους· καὶ γὰρ ποιεῖτε αὐτὸ εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἀδελφούς⁴ 10

¹ Add δ. ² καὶ δόντα τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ . . εἰς ἡμᾶς. ³ ἔχετε. ⁴ Add τοὺς.

θυμίας, in ver. 5., because it might be said, that though the heathen were distinguished from Christians by immorality, they were not so by an abuse of the marriage-bed in particular. But the words, ἐν πάθει ἐπιθυμίας, though forming an antithesis to ἐν ἁγιασμῷ καὶ τιμῇ, need not necessarily, when applied to the heathen, carry us back to κτᾶσθαι τὸ σκεῦος. In ver. 5. these latter words are lost sight of and some general idea gathered from them, such as "living" ἐν πάθει ἐπιθυμίας.

5. μὴ ἐν πάθει ἐπιθυμίας, *not in the lust of concupiscence.*] By the word πάθος is implied the state of yielding to lust, the state in which lust becomes the reigning principle.

6. τὸ μὴ ὑπερβαίνειν] is a further resumption and definition of ver. 4. The article only gives the clause a substantive, instead of an infinitive form as above, ὁ ἁγιασμός ὑμῶν, which, though a substantive, stands in apposition with ἀπέχασθαι.

Another aspect is thus presented to us of sins of the flesh; the

wrong done to our neighbour. It is not necessary to suppose that any idea of unchastity is conveyed by the term πλεονεκτεῖν, any more than in the tenth commandment, "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife." The meaning exclusively arises from the connexion and application of the word.

ἐν τῷ πράγματι, not for ἐν τινι, nor for ἐν τούτῳ τῷ πράγματι, but simply, *in the matter*, i. e. of which we are speaking, as elsewhere, without a distinct antecedent. As similarly wanting in a precise antecedent, compare, iii. 3., ἐν ταῖς θλίψεσιν ταύταις, and just below, περὶ πάντων τούτων. Although ἐν τῷ πράγματι is not put, *usu modesto*, for *concubitu*, yet it is probable that the obscurity of the passage arises partly from the decency in which the Apostle clothes it. The expression occurs again 2 Cor. vii. 11.

περὶ πάντων τούτων, *about all these things.*] That is, all the different sins of uncleanness.

καὶ προείπαμεν.] καὶ = too, moreover; as moreover we told you, and, I may say, in still

- concupiscence, even as the Gentiles which know not
 6 God: that no man go beyond and defraud his brother
 in the matter: because that the Lord is the avenger
 of all these things, as we also forewarned you and testified.
 7 For God called us not unto uncleanness, but in sancti-
 8 fication. He therefore that despiseth, despiseth not
 man, but God, who ¹ giveth unto you his holy Spirit.
 9 But as touching brotherly love ² we need not to write
 unto you: for ye yourselves are taught of God to
 10 love one another. And indeed ye do it toward all the

¹ Who hath also given unto us.² Ye need not that I write.

stronger language testified to you. Compare *προελέγομεν*, iii. 4.

7. ἐπὶ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ, *for God calls us not to uncleanness.*] Compare ἐπ' ἐλευθερίᾳ ἐκλήθητε, Gal. v. 13. The preposition ἐπὶ in such expressions wavers between the senses of object and condition. ἐν signifies the state in which men are called (compare Gal. i. 6.), or which results from their calling. It often happens that modes of thought vary without corresponding variations of meaning; the same Christian grace may be represented indifferently as a condition, or an object, or a state, or a result. There is no need, therefore, to make an antithesis between ἐπὶ and ἐν, the inversion of which would not have involved any change in the sense. The appearance of antithesis arises, partly from the love of variety natural to all language, partly from an awkwardness in the use of language, in a late and rhetorical age, by a writer who was imperfectly master of it.

8. *τοιγαροῦν ὁ ἀθετῶν*, therefore the despiser (that is of the commands which have preceded)

despises not man but God, who, gives to you his Holy Spirit. Compare iii. 13. The latter words, τὸν διδόντα, are a repetition of the reason conveyed by ἐκάλεσεν. They serve to heighten the heinousness of the sin, and at the same time suggest why it was unnatural that the Thessalonians should commit it.

9. But (to turn to another subject) concerning love to the brethren, I have no need to write to you; for that is a lesson ye already know, being taught of God himself to the end that ye love one another.

The meaning is not simply, "I need not teach you, for God himself teaches you;" but I need not teach you, for God teaches you effectually. The rhetorical turn "I have no need" is characteristic of the Apostle. Comp. v. 12.; 2 Cor. ix. 1.; Philemon, 19. εἰς implies at once result and object: "For ye give the best evidence of having learnt it by your actions towards all the brethren in all Macedonia. ποιείτε, not in word only, but ye do acts of love. αὐτό, sc. τὰ ἀγαπᾶν.

ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ Μακεδονίᾳ. παρακαλοῦμεν δὲ ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, περισσεύειν μᾶλλον καὶ φιλοτιμεῖσθαι ἡσυχάζειν καὶ ¹¹ πρᾶσσειν τὰ ἴδια καὶ ἐργάζεσθαι ταῖς¹ χερσὶν ὑμῶν, καθὼς ὑμῖν παρηγγείλαμεν, ἵνα περιπατῇτε εὐσχημόνως πρὸς ¹² τοὺς ἔξω καὶ μηδενὸς χρεῖαν ἔχητε.

Οὐ θέλομεν² δὲ ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν, ἀδελφοί, περὶ τῶν κοιμωμένων³, ἵνα μὴ λυπήσθε καθὼς καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ οἱ μὴ ἔχοντες

¹ Add ἰδίαις.

² θέλω.

³ κεκοιμημένων.

10. παρακαλοῦμεν δέ, *but we beseech you.*] The most convenient way of taking these words is to separate them from what has preceded and connect them with what follows: — “But we beseech you, brethren, to increase more and more and make quietness the object of your ambition.” *περισσεύειν* may refer to brotherly love, but is not necessarily confined to it.

11. *φιλοτιμεῖσθαι ἡσυχάζειν*, κ. τ. λ.] These words derive their chief illustration from the Second Epistle. From both together we infer that the Church had fallen into disorder, and that some of its members had given up their daily occupations. This disorder may very probably have arisen from an expectation of the immediate coming of Christ. See note at the end of the chapter. Supposing this to be the case, a thread of connexion is supplied with the new subject, which suggests itself to the Apostle's mind at v. 13. The Thessalonians are excited and unsettled, and one of the causes of their unsettlement is the state of the dead.

12. *ἵνα περιπατῇτε εὐσχημόνως*] is a counsel of prudence rather than brotherly love. Comp. Col. iv. 5.; 1 Tim. iii. 7.; 1 Cor. xiv. 24. It is characteristic of St.

Paul to ask, “What will the Gentiles say of us?” a part of the Christian prudence, which was one of the great features of his life.

καὶ μηδενὸς χρεῖαν ἔχητε.] *μηδενὸς* is here the neuter. These words supply a further reason for their working diligently, “that they might not be in want.”

13. The Apostle passes on with a formula that he employs elsewhere (*οὐ θέλομεν δὲ ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν, ἀδελφοί*), to a new subject, the state of the departed. The train of thought may possibly have been suggested by the previous exhortation to be diligent in their daily occupations, the missing link being that their occupations had been interrupted by the expectation of the coming of Christ. It may also have been a reply to an inquiry, or may have originated in the Apostle hearing of the anxiety of the converts, who found that a gloom was cast upon their faith in Christ, by the death of some one of their number. Their sadness was not as to whether or not there was a future state, but whether those who were already dead should participate in the coming reign of Christ. To the Jew of old, death seemed sad, because it took men away from the presence of God.

brethren which are in all Macedonia: but we beseech
 11 you, brethren, to increase more and more; and to
 study to be quiet, and do your own business, and work
 12 with your¹ hands, as we commanded you; that ye may
 walk honestly towards them that are without, and may
 have lack of nothing.

13 But we² would not have you to be ignorant, brethren,
 concerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not,
 14 even as the others which have no hope. For if we

¹ Add own.

² I.

Yet more sad must it have appeared to the uninstructed mind of the first converts, because it took them away in the very hour when it seemed good to live, "waiting for the Son from heaven."

Οὕτω δὲ ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν.] Comp. Rom. i. 13.; xi. 25.; 1 Cor. x. 1.; xii. i.; 2 Cor. i. 8., in which passages it is used to give emphasis to the subject which the Apostle is introducing.

καθὼς καὶ οἱ λοιποί, as the others.] The heathen, as in Ephesians, ii. 3.

It would be easy to multiply quotations from classical writers in illustration of this expression, like the words of Theocritus, Idyll. iv. 42., ἐλπίδες ἐν ζωοῖσιν, ἀνέλπιστοι δὲ θανόντες; or the mournful strain of Catullus, v. 4., "Soles occidere et redire possent. Nobis quum semel occidit brevis lux nox est perpetua una dormienda;" or the life-like touch of Lucretius, iii. 942., "Nec quisquam expergitus exstat, frigida quem semel est vitæ pausa secuta;" or the sad complaints of Cicero and Quintilian over the loss of their children; or the dreary hope of an immortality of

fame in Tacitus or Thucydides. The language of the Old Testament, though more religious, is in many passages hardly more cheering: "The living, the living, he shall praise thee. What profit is there in the grave? Shall they that go down into the pit, declare thy truth?"

A future state, it has been said, was discovered by the ancient world, like the Copernican system, as one guess among many. Rather say it was a shadow, a thought, a hope, a poetical fancy, to which the traditions of ages had given a sort of reality. It would be idle to talk of it as a subject of belief. That the mythology which had lost its hold on this world, should have retained it in reference to the shadowy forms of another, would be, indeed, incredible. Even Socrates knew not whether he was laughing at himself and others, in speaking of a world to come and of the souls of just men made perfect (Phædo, 64.). And, if we argue from the analogy of human nature among ourselves, there is no reason to think that any natural terror would make itself a consolation. All men are re-

ἐλπίδα. εἰ γὰρ πιστεύομεν ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἀπέθανεν καὶ 14
 ἀνέστη, οὕτως καὶ ὁ θεὸς τοὺς κοιμηθέντας διὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ
 ἄξει σὺν αὐτῷ. τοῦτο γὰρ ὑμῖν λέγομεν ἐν λόγῳ κυρίου, 15
 ὅτι ἡμεῖς οἱ ζῶντες οἱ περιλειπόμενοι εἰς τὴν παρουσίαν τοῦ
 κυρίου οὐ μὴ φθάσωμεν τοὺς κοιμηθέντας, ὅτι αὐτὸς ὁ 16
 κύριος ἐν κελεύσματι, ἐν φωνῇ ἀρχαγγέλου καὶ ἐν σάλπιγγι

signed to death; they sorrow indeed, but not for themselves, but for the loss of friends or children.

14. The connexion may be traced as follows:—"I would not have you sorrow for the dead, for they are one with Christ; and as they are dead with him, shall also rise with him." Compare Rom. viii. 11.

εἰ γὰρ πιστεύομεν, *for if we believe.*] In the apodosis, we expect καὶ πιστεύειν δεῖ ὅτι. The Apostle has shortened the expression.

ὁ θεός.] He that raised up Christ from the dead.

διὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ.] Not the martyrs, as the Apostle is here speaking of the whole communion of the dead, as in the verse that follows of the whole communion of the living; nor will the order of the words allow us to connect them with ἄξει. The only remaining mode is to take διὰ for ἐν, those that are asleep in Christ.

ἄξει σὺν αὐτῷ.] The dead are already risen, and will reappear with Christ at his reappearance.

15. τοῦτο γὰρ ὑμῖν.] The Apostle adds emphatically:—"And this I say to you not of myself, but by the word of Christ." It has been asked respecting this passage, as well as in reference to 1 Cor. vii. 10., whether St. Paul is referring to some special saying of our Lord on these subjects, *i. e.* resurrection and divorce, or to a

revelation which he had received from Him. Neither of the passages supposed to be alluded to (Matt. xxiv. 31., or John, v. 25.) is sufficiently near in sense to make it safe for us to identify them; while a strong negative argument may be urged on the other side, from the fact of no other quotations in St. Paul's writings being apparently derived from our canonical Gospels. It may be further adduced as an argument in favour of the supposition that St. Paul is referring to actual words of Christ, that he nowhere speaks of any special truths or doctrines as imparted to himself. When he uses the expression, "not I, but the Lord," 1 Cor. vii. 12., he is speaking of matters of discipline, not of doctrine.

The question suggests a wider one, which is equally incapable of receiving a precise answer:—"What did St. Paul know of the life of Christ?" Two passages only throw any considerable light on this subject. First, 1 Cor. xv. 3—10., in which the Apostle describes himself, not only as preaching to the Corinthians the doctrine of the resurrection of Christ, but as dwelling on the minute circumstances which attested it. Had he told them in like manner of other events in the life of Christ? Had the parables and discourses of Christ interwoven themselves in his teaching?

- believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them
also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him.
15 For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that
we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the
16 Lord shall not prevent them which sleep; because the
Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout,

Were the miracles of Christ a witness to which he appealed?

It is instructive to put these questions, even though they remain without an answer. St. Paul must have known numberless persons who had followed the footsteps of the Lord on earth; and yet the only memorial which he has preserved is the short fragment, "It is more blessed to give than to receive," which forms the second of the two quotations alluded to above (Acts, xx. 35. Compare 1 Tim. vi. 13.; the mention of the institution of the Lord's Supper, in 1 Cor. xi. 24.; also Phil. ii. 7., 2 Cor. viii. 9.). Had all the things that were known of Christ in the days of the Apostle been written down, "the world itself," it might be said, would hardly have contained "the books that should be written;" and yet, as far as we can trace, it was not the sayings or events of the life of Christ, but the witness of the Old Testament prophets, that formed the larger part of St. Paul's teaching, the "external" evidence by which he supported, in himself and others, the inward and living sense of union with Christ, the medium through which he preached "Christ crucified."

ὅτι ἡμεῖς οἱ ζῶντες.] Is St. Paul speaking here of his own generation only? or are the living at a particular time put for the living in general, these

being spoken of in the first person by way of contrast with the dead from whom they are parted? In 1 Cor. xv. 51., if we adopt Lachmann's reading, the Apostle seems to number himself, not among the living, but among the dead, at the coming of Christ. The mode of thought in the present passage is not precisely similar, but yet not entirely different. We may consider *ἡμεῖς οἱ ζῶντες* as a figure of the living in general, just as *οἱ κοιμώμενοι*, though primarily referring to the dead in the Thessalonian Church, is also put for the dead in general. It is nevertheless true, that the words imply the immediate expectation of Christ's coming. The Apostle could not have said "we," if he had had a distinct perception that the coming of Christ was still far distant.

οὐ μὴ φθάσωμεν, *shall not prevent.*] i. e. shall not leave behind those that are asleep.

16. ὅτι αὐτός ὁ κύριος.] *αὐτός* is added to give dignity to the coming of Christ. "The Lord himself."

κελεύσματος.] with a cry of command, as of a general to his host. The words *ἐν φωνῇ ἀρχαγγέλου* and *ἐν σάλπιγγι θεοῦ* are added as an epexegetis to express the mode of giving the command. As in the Old Testament, the Lord was to come surrounded by his saints, with the archangel as the

θεοῦ καταβήσεται ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ, καὶ οἱ νεκροὶ ἐν χριστῷ
 ἀναστήσονται πρῶτον, ἔπειτα ἡμεῖς οἱ ζῶντες οἱ περιλει- 17
 πόμενοι ἅμα σὺν αὐτοῖς ἄρπαγησόμεθα ἐν νεφέλαις εἰς
 ἀπάντησιν τοῦ κυρίου εἰς ἀέρα, καὶ οὕτως πάντοτε σὺν
 κυρίῳ ἐσόμεθα. ὥστε παρακαλεῖτε ἀλλήλους ἐν τοῖς λόγοις 18
 τούτοις.

captain of his host, and the sound of the trumpet as on Mount Sinai. Compare 1 Cor. xv. 52.; Matt. xxiv. 42.; Jude, 14.; where the word ἀρχάγγελος also occurs.

καὶ οἱ νεκροὶ ἐν χριστῷ, *and the dead in Christ.*] Here, as in 1 Cor. xv., the Apostle confines himself to the resurrection of the just. He does not carry on his thoughts to the question what destiny was to be reserved for the wicked, still less to the further question, what was to become of the multitude of the heathen. The first act of the last drama, πρῶτον, is

the resurrection of the dead who are to meet Christ; the second, the gathering to them of the inhabitants of the earth.

Where the things of which we are speaking, are such as eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man to conceive, which can only be expressed in figures of speech and types of the Old Testament, it is vain to attempt to define exactly the meaning of particular words, or to fill up the figures by which the general meaning is conveyed. Such an attempt is

- with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of
 17 God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first: then we
 which are alive and remain shall be caught up together
 with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air:
 18 and so shall we ever be with the Lord. Wherefore
 comfort one another with these words.

like painting a picture of the scenes in the Apocalypse, which, the moment they are brought together, are seen to have a prophetic and symbolical meaning, not an artistic unity.

17. *εἰς τὸν αἶρα, into the air.*] The Apostle speaks not of the earth, or of the heaven, as the scene of this first meeting of the living and the dead with their common Lord and with each other, but of the mid-air. Interpreters go on to ask if he supposed the air to be the abiding-seat of Christ's

kingdom. Is not this a question about the propriety of figures of speech? Yet admitting that we are discussing the shadows of those things, and not the very things themselves, it agrees better with the Apostle's usual language to regard heaven as the final and everlasting home of Christians, while on the other hand the air is appropriated to the powers of evil (Eph. ii. 2.).

καὶ οὕτως] "and thus after we have once met the Lord, shall we ever be with the Lord."

EVILS IN THE CHURCH OF THE APOSTOLICAL AGE.

WERE we, with the view of forming a judgment of the moral state of the early Church, to examine the subjects of rebuke most frequently referred to by the Apostle, these would be found to range themselves under four heads:—first, licentiousness; secondly, disorder; thirdly, scruples of conscience; fourthly, strifes about doctrine and teachers. The consideration of these four subjects, the two former falling in with the argument of the Epistle to the Thessalonians, the two latter more closely connected with the Romans and the Galatians, will give what may be termed the darker side of the primitive Church.

1. Licentiousness was the besetting sin of the Roman world. Except by a miracle, it was impossible that the new converts could be at once and wholly freed from it. It lingered in the flesh when the spirit had cast it off. It had interwoven itself in the pagan religions; and, if we may believe the writings of adversaries, was ever reappearing on the confines of the Church in the earliest heresies. Even within the pale of the Church, it might assume the form of a mystic Christianity. The very ecstasy of conversion would often lead to a reaction. Nothing is more natural than that in a licentious city, like Corinth or Ephesus, those who were impressed by St. Paul's teaching should have gone their way, and returned to their former life. In this case it would seldom happen that they apostatized into the ranks of the heathen: the same impulse which led them to the Gospel, would lead them also to bridge the gulf which separated

them from its purer morality. Many may have sinned and repented again and again, unable to stand themselves in the general corruption, yet unable to cast aside utterly the image of innocence and goodness which the Apostle had set before them. There were those, again, who consciously sought to lead the double life, and imagined themselves to have found in licentiousness the true freedom of the Gospel.

The tone which the Apostle adopts respecting sins of the flesh, differs in many ways from the manner of speaking of them among moralists of modern times. He says nothing of the poison which they infuse into society, or the consequences to the individual himself. It is not in this way that moral evils are presented to us in Scripture. Neither does he appeal to public opinion as condemning them, or dwell on the ruin involved in them to one half of the human race. True and forcible as these aspects of such sins are, they are the result of modern reflection, not the first instincts of reason and conscience. They strengthen the moral principles of mankind, but are not of a kind to touch the individual soul. They are a good defence for the existing order of society; but they will not purify the nature of man, or extinguish the flames of lust.

Moral evils in the New Testament are always spoken of as spiritual. They corrupt the soul; they defile the temple of the Holy Ghost; they cut men off from the body of Christ. Of morality, as distinct from religion, there is hardly a trace in the Epistles of St. Paul. What he seeks to penetrate is the inward nature of sin, not its outward effects. Even its consequences in another state of being are but slightly touched upon, in comparison with that living death which itself is. It is not merely a vice or crime, or even an offence against the law of God, to be punished here or hereafter. It is more than this. It is what men feel within, not what they observe without them; not what shall be, but what is; a terrible consciousness, a mystery of iniquity, a communion with unseen powers of evil.

All sin is spoken of in the Epistles of St. Paul, as rooted in human nature, and quickened by the consciousness of law; but especially is

this the case with the sin which is more than any other the type of sin in general — fornication. It is, in a peculiar sense, the sin of the flesh, with which the very idea of the corruption of the flesh is closely connected, just as, in 1 Thess. iv. 3., the idea of holiness is regarded as almost equivalent to abstinence from the commission of it. It is a sin against a man's own body, distinguished from all other sins by its personal and individual nature. No other is at the same time so gross and so insidious; no other partakes so much of the slavery of sin. As marriage is the type of the communion of Christ and his Church, as the body is the member of Christ, so the sin of fornication is a strange and mysterious union with evil.

But although such is the tone of the Apostle, there is no violence to human nature in his commands respecting it. He knew how easily extremes meet, how hard it is for asceticism to make clean that which is within, how quickly it might itself pass into its opposite. Nothing can be more different from the spirit of early ecclesiastical history on this subject, than the moderation of St. Paul. The remedy for sin is not celibacy, but marriage. Even second marriages are, for the prevention of sin, to be encouraged. In the same spirit is his treatment of the incestuous person. He had committed a sin not even named among the Gentiles, for which he was to be delivered unto Satan, for which all the Church should humble themselves; yet upon his true repentance, no ban is to separate him from the rest of the brethren, no doom of endless penance is recorded against him. Whatever might have been the enormity of his offence, he was to be forgiven, as in heaven, so on earth.

The manner in which the Corinthian Church are described as regarding this offence before the Apostle's rebuke to them, no less than the lenient sentence of the Apostle himself afterwards, as well as his constant admonitions on the same subject in all his Epistles, must be regarded as indications of the state of morality among the first converts. Above all other things, the Apostle insisted on purity as the first note of the Christian character; and yet the very earnestness and frequency of his warnings show that he is speaking,

not of a sin hardly named among saints, but of one the victory over which was the greatest and most difficult triumph of the cross of Christ.

2. It is hard to resist the impression which naturally arises in our minds, that the early Church was without spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; as it were, a bride adorned for her husband, the type of Christian purity, the model of Apostolical order. The real image is marred with human frailty; its evils, perhaps, arising more from this cause than any other, that in its commencement it was a kingdom not of this world; in other words, it had no political existence or legal support; hence there is no evil more frequently referred to in the Epistles than disorder.

This spirit of disorder was manifested in various ways. In the Church of Corinth, the communion of the Lord's Supper was administered so as to be a scandal; "one was hungry, and another was drunken." There was as yet no rite or custom to which all conformed. In the same Church, the spiritual gifts were manifested without rule or order. It seemed as if God was not the author of peace, but of confusion. All spoke together, men and women, apparently without distinction, singing, praying, teaching, uttering words unintelligible to the rest, with no regular succession or subordination (1 Cor. xiv.). The scene in their assemblies was such, that if an unbeliever had come in, he would have said they were mad.

Evils of this kind in a great measure arose from the absence of Church authority. Even the Apostle himself persuades more often than commands, and often uses language which implies a sort of hesitation whether his rule would be acknowledged or not. The diverse offices, the figure of the members and the body, do not refer to what was, but to what ought to be, to an ideal of harmonious life and action, which the Apostle holds up before them, which in practice was far from being realized. The Church was not organized, but was in process of organization. Its only punishment was excommunication, which, as in modern so in primitive times, could not be

enforced against the wishes of the majority. In two cases only are members of the Church "delivered unto Satan" (1 Cor. v. 5.; 1 Tim. i. 20.). It was a moral and spiritual, not a legal control that was exercised. Hence the frequent admonitions given, doubtless, because they were needed: "Obey them that have the rule over you."

A second kind of disorder arose from unsettlement of mind. Of such unsettlement, we find traces in the levity and vanity of the Corinthians; in the fickleness with which the Galatians left St. Paul for the false teachers; almost, may we not say? in the very passion with which the Apostle addresses them; above all, in the case of the Thessalonians. How few among all the converts, were there capable of truly discerning their relation to the world around! or of supporting themselves alone when the fervour of conversion had passed away and the Apostle was no longer present with them! They had entered into a state so different from that of their fellow-men, that it might well be termed supernatural. The ordinary experience of men was no longer their guide. They left their daily employments. The great change which they felt within, seemed to extend itself without and involve the world in its shadow. So "palpable to sense" was the vision of Christ's coming again, that their only fear or doubt was how the departed would have a share in it. No religious belief could be more unsettling than this: that to-day, or to-morrow, or the third day, before the sun set or the dawn arose, the sign of the Son of man might appear in the clouds of heaven. It was not possible to take thought for the morrow, to study to be quiet and get their own living, when men hardly expected the morrow. Death comes to individuals now, as nature prepares them for it; but the immediate expectation of Christ's coming is out of the course of nature. Young and old alike look for it. It is a resurrection of the world itself, and implies a corresponding revolution in the thoughts, feelings, and purposes of men.

A third kind of disorder may have arisen from the same causes, but seems to have assumed another character. As among the Jews, so among the first Christians, these were those who needed to be

perpetually reminded, that the powers that be were ordained of God. The heathen converts could not at once lay aside the licentiousness of manners amid which they had been brought up; no more could the Jewish converts give up their aspirations, that at this time "the kingdom was to be restored to Israel," which had perhaps been in some cases their first attraction to the Gospel. A community springing up in Palestine under the dominion of the Romans, could not be expected exactly to draw the line between the things that were Cæsar's and the things that were God's, or to understand in what sense "the children were free," in what sense it was nevertheless their duty to pay tribute. The frequent exhortations to obey magistrates, are a proof at once of the tendency to rebellion, and of the energy with which the Apostles set themselves against it.

3. The third head of our inquiry related to scruples of conscience, which were chiefly of two kinds; regarding either the observance of days, or the eating with unclean or unbelievers. Were they, or were they not, to observe the Jewish Sabbath, or new moon, or passover? Such questions as these are not to be considered the fancies or opinions of individuals; but, as mankind are quick enough to discover, involve general principles, and are but the outward signs of some deep and radical difference. In the question of the observance of Jewish feasts, and still more in the question of going in unto men uncircumcised and eating with them, was implied the whole question of the relation of the disciple of Christ to the Jew, just as the question of sitting at meat in the idol's temple, was the question of the relation of the disciple of Christ to the Gentile. Was the Christian to preserve his caste, and remain within the pale of Judaism? Was he in his daily life to carry his religious scruples so far as to exclude himself from the social life of the heathen world? How much prudence and liberty and charity was necessary for the solution of such difficulties?

Freedom is the key-note of the Gospel, as preached by St. Paul. "All things are lawful." "There is no distinction of Jew or Greek, barbarian or Scythian, bond or free." "Let no man judge you of

a new moon or a Sabbath." "Where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." And yet, if we go back to its origin, the Christian Church was born into the world marked and diversified with the features of the religions that had preceded it, bound within the curtains of the tabernacle, coloured with Oriental opinions that refused to be washed out of the minds of men. The scruples of individuals are but indications of the elements out of which the Church was composed. There were narrow paths in which men walked, customs which clung to them long after the reason of them had ceased, observances which they were unable to give up, though conscience and reason alike disowned them, which were based on the traditions of half the world, and could not be relinquished, however alien to the spirit of the Gospel. Slowly and gradually, as Christianity itself became more spread, these remnants of Judaism or Orientalism disappeared, and the spirit which had been taught from the beginning, made itself felt in the hearts of men and in the institutions of the Church.

4. The heresies of the Apostolical age are a subject too wide for illustration in a note. We shall attempt no more than to bring together the names and heads of opinion which occur in Scripture, with the view of completing the preceding sketch.

There was the party of Peter and of Paul, of the circumcision and of the uncircumcision. There were those who knew Christ according to the flesh; those who, like St. Paul, knew him only as revealed within. There were others who, after casting aside circumcision, were still struggling between the old dispensation and the new. There were those who never went beyond the baptism of John; others, again, to whom the Gospel of Christ clothed itself in Alexandrian language. There were prophets, speakers with tongues, discerners of spirits, interpreters of tongues. There were those who looked daily for the coming of Christ; others who said that the Resurrection was passed already. There were seekers after knowledge, falsely so called; worshippers of angels, intruders into things they had not seen. There were those who maintained an Oriental

asceticism in their lives, "forbidding to marry, commanding to abstain from meats." There was the doctrine of the Nicolaitans, the synagogue of Satan, who "said that they were Jews and are not," "the woman Jezebel, which calleth herself a prophetess." There were wild heretics, "many anti-Christ's," "grievous wolves, entering into the fold," apostasy of whole churches at once. There were mingled anarchy and licentiousness, "filthy dreamers, despising dominion, speaking evil of dignities," of whom no language is too strong for St. Paul or St. John to use, though they seem to have been separated by no definite line from the Church itself. There were fainter contrasts, too, of those who agreed in the unity of the same spirit, aspects and points of view, as we term them, of faith and works, of the Epistle to the Romans and the Epistle to the Hebrews.

How this outline is to be filled up must for ever remain, in a great degree, matter of speculation. Yet there is not a single trait here mentioned, which does not re-appear in the second century, either within the Church or without it, more or less prominent as favoured by circumstances or the reverse. The beginning of Ebionitism, Sabaism, Gnosticism, Montanism, Alexandrianism, Orientalism, and of the wild licentiousness which marked the course of several of them, are all discernible in the Apostolical age. They would be more correctly regarded, not as offshoots of Christianity, but as the soil in which it arose. Some of them seem to acquire a temporary principle of life, and to grow up parallel with the Church itself. As opinions and tendencies of the human mind, many linger among us to the present day. Only after the destruction of Jerusalem, with the spread of the Gospel over the world, as the spirit of the East moves towards the West, Judaism fades and dies away, to rise again, as some hold, in the glorified form of a mediæval Church.

Such is the reverse side of the picture of the Apostolical age; what proportions we should give to each feature it is impossible to determine. We need not infer that all Churches were in the same disorder as Corinth and Galatia; nor can we say how far the more flagrant evils were tamely submitted to by the Church itself. There

was much of good that we can never know ; much also of evil. And perhaps the general lesson which we gather from the preceding considerations is, not that the state of the primitive Church was better or worse than our first thoughts would have suggested, but that its state was one in which good and evil exercised a more vital power, were more subtly intermingled with, and more easily passed into each other. All things were coming to the birth, some in one way, some in another. The supports of custom, of opinion, of tradition, had given away ; human nature was, as it were, thrown upon itself and the guidance of the spirit of God. There were as many diversities of human character in the world then as now ; more strange influences of religion and race than have ever since met in one ; a far greater yearning of the human intellect to solve the problems of existence. There was no settled principle of morality independent of, and above religious convictions. All these causes are sufficient to account for the diversities of opinion or practice, as well as for the extremes which met in the bosom of the primitive Church.

Περὶ δὲ τῶν χρόνων καὶ τῶν καιρῶν, ἀδελφοί, οὐ χρειάν 5
 ἔχετε ὑμῖν γράφεσθαι· αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἀκριβῶς οἴδατε ὅτι 2
 ἡμέρα κυρίου ὡς κλέπτῃς ἐν νυκτὶ οὕτως ἔρχεται. ὅταν 3
 [δὲ¹] λέγωσιν Εἰρήνη καὶ ἀσφάλεια, τότε αἰφνίδιος αὐτοῖς
 ἐφίσταται ὀλεθρος ὥσπερ ἡ ὥδιν τῇ ἐν γαστρὶ ἐχούσῃ, καὶ
 οὐ μὴ ἐκφύγωσιν. ὑμεῖς δέ, ἀδελφοί, οὐκ ἐστὲ ἐν σκότει, 4

¹ γάρ.

The Apostle had been speaking of the coming of Christ in the clouds of heaven. The question would naturally arise in the minds of the Thessalonians, "When shall these things be?" But this they already know as far as it can be known. (Compare the turn of iv. 9.) And all that can be known is that "The day of the Lord cometh as a thief in the night." The world is lying in darkness, asleep, ready to be surprised. But they are the children of the day, having a light within anticipating the dawn; they may not be asleep, they cannot be surprised; they are to arm themselves as soldiers of Christ, taking the breastplate of faith and the helmet of salvation; for to salvation they are appointed through Christ Jesus, with whom they are one in life and death.

Many characteristics of St. Paul are crowded in this passage. First, the rhetorical turn, οὐ χρειάν ἔχετε. Secondly, the subtle transition in the use of the metaphor of the day of the Lord to the moral lesson that they are to walk as children of the day. (Compare Rom. xiii. 1—14.) Thirdly, the imagery of v. 8.; (compare Ephes. vi.); also the going off upon the word σωτηρία, which is made the link of the following verse. Fourthly, the

thought of our identity with Christ, in which is still retained the allusion to sleeping and waking. And lastly, in the 11th verse the resumption of the precept which closes the preceding chapter.

Led by some hidden train of association, either because the expectation of the day of the Lord had caused disorder among them, or as a sequel to the precept, that they should walk soberly as children of the light, the Apostle goes on to exhort his converts to obey those who are set over them in the Lord. Then follow (as towards the close of several Epistles) isolated precepts succeeding each other in order sometimes of meaning, sometimes of form, passing from the particular to the general, or from the general to the particular, and ending with a final prayer for their sanctification, by the God who can heal disorder, and can and will preserve them blameless against the day of the Lord Jesus. The Epistle concludes with the salutation of the brethren, the charge that the Epistle should be read to all, and the benediction.

V. 1. οὐ χρειάν ἔχετε, *ye have no need.*] Perhaps because the Apostle had told them, or because the sudden coming of Christ was a universal belief with the first

5 But of the times and the seasons, brethren, ye have
 2 no need that I write unto you. For yourselves know
 perfectly that the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief
 3 in the night. But¹ when they shall say, Peace and
 safety; then sudden destruction cometh upon them, as
 travail upon a woman with child; and they shall not
 4 escape. But ye, brethren, are not in darkness, that that

¹ For.

converts. So in modern times a preacher might say, "There is no need for me to speak to you of the uncertainty of life."

2. *ἡ ἡμέρα κυρίου, the day of the Lord.*] Neither the day of death to individuals, nor the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, nor in the common sense the end of the world. More truly should we say that the Apostle meant all these, ere they had separated themselves from the indistinct future. It was the day spoken of by the prophet Joel, referred to by St. Peter in the Acts, and prophesied of by Christ himself, in which the destruction of Jerusalem was to be followed by the sign of the Son of man in the clouds, and in which wars and tumults, as well as natural convulsions, were to herald the end of the world. It was the day of Christ Himself, in which the Apostle was to receive his reward and the work in the hearts of his converts to be completed. (2 Thess. ii. 2.; 1 Cor. i. 8., v. 5.; 2 Cor. i. 14.; Philipp. i. 6. 10., ii. 16.)

3. *ὅταν δὲ λέγωσιν, but when they shall say.*] *ἔτι*, if genuine, expresses the opposition of the fact to their expectation. "But they shall be saying peace and

safety when sudden destruction comes upon them." By an awkwardness of expression it is joined to the protasis of the sentence.

The signs of the end of the world are described elsewhere to be such as would arrest and amaze men; here "the kingdom of God cometh not with observation;" yet it is not said, as our Saviour adds, "the kingdom of God is within you." In different passages of Scripture, and even in the same passage, the coming of the kingdom of God is described to us under contradictory aspects. It is near, it is not near; visible, and invisible; marked by signs, and yet discernible to God only. It is in the clouds of heaven and in the human soul at once. And everywhere the thoughts are drawn off from the over-curious consideration of its form and manner to the practical lesson which may be gathered from it.

4. *ὑμεῖς δὲ, ἀδελφοί, but ye, brethren.*] There was another point of view in which the day of the Lord might be regarded. Though it would break in with a sudden light upon the heathen world, to the Christian the light which it brought would be that which was already shed abroad in his heart.

ἵνα ὑμᾶς ἡ ἡμέρα ὡς κλέπτας¹ καταλάβῃ· πάντες γὰρ² 5
 ὑμεῖς υἱοὶ φωτός ἐστέ καὶ υἱοὶ ἡμέρας. οὐκ ἐσμὲν νυκτὸς
 οὐδὲ σκότους. ἄρα οὖν μὴ καθεύδωμεν ὡς οἱ λοιποί, ἀλλὰ 6
 γρηγορῶμεν καὶ νήφωμεν. οἱ γὰρ καθεύδοντες νυκτὸς 7
 καθεύδουσιν, καὶ οἱ μεθυσκόμενοι νυκτὸς μεθύουσιν· ἡμεῖς 8
 δὲ ἡμέρας ὄντες νήφωμεν, ἐνδυσάμενοι θώρακα πίστεως
 καὶ ἀγάπης καὶ περικεφαλαίαν ἐλπίδα σωτηρίας, ὅτι οὐκ 9
 ἔθετο ἡμᾶς ὁ θεὸς εἰς ὀργήν, ἀλλ' εἰς περιποίησιν σωτηρίας
 διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, τοῦ ἀποθανόντος 10
 ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, ἵνα εἴτε γρηγορῶμεν εἴτε καθεύδωμεν ἅμα σὺν

¹ ἡ ἡμέρα ὑμᾶς ὡς κλέπτης.² Omit γάρ.

[*ἵνα.*] Not, that "the purpose of God may be fulfilled, of coming suddenly on you," which seems far-fetched, but simply denoting a consequence, "for the day of the Lord to come upon you."

5. πάντες γὰρ ὑμεῖς υἱοὶ φωτός ἐστε, *for ye are all the children of light.*] The Apostle strengthens and expresses more generally what had been said in the previous verse. Ye, brethren, are not in darkness; for ye are all sons of light and sons of day.

6. As children of the light, let us be children of the light in our life and conversation. Others sleep; but we must watch. Others may be drunken; but we must be sober. The Apostle gives a similar turn to "the day of the Lord," in Rom. xiii. 12.:—"The night is far spent, the day is at hand: let us therefore cast off the works of darkness, and let us put on the armour of light. As in the day, let us walk soberly." Compare also, for a parallel association of ideas, what we may venture to term the irony of our Lord to his disciples, in John, xi. 9.:—"Are there not twelve

hours in the day? If any man walk in the day, he stumbleth not, because he seeth the light of this world."

7. οἱ γὰρ καθεύδοντες, *for they that sleep.*] Night and day co-exist. They are separated, as it were, rather by place than by time. The night of the world is the day in the believer's soul. In the words, οἱ γὰρ καθεύδοντες, is implied a latent allusion to the state of the heathen. Compare with the whole passage, Eph. v. 8. "For ye were sometimes darkness, but now are ye light in the Lord: walk as children of light." 13. "But all things that are reprov'd are made manifest by the light: for whatsoever doth make manifest is light." 14. "Wherefore he saith, Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light."

Dropping the simile in such passages, their general meaning may be said to be, "let us be what we are." There are two great modes in which the Christian state is represented to us in Scripture, which, as in this pas-

5 day should overtake you as thieves¹: for² ye are all the children of light, and the children of the day. We are
6 not of the night, nor of darkness. Therefore let us not sleep, as do the others; but let us watch and be sober.
7 For they that sleep sleep in the night; and they that
8 be drunken are drunken in the night. But let us who are of the day, be sober, putting on the breastplate of faith and love; and for an helmet, the hope of salvation.
9 For God hath not appointed us to wrath, but to obtain
10 salvation by our Lord Jesus Christ, who died for us, that, whether we wake or sleep, we may live together

¹ A thief.² Omit for.

sage, readily pass into each other: the first, as it may be termed, progressive, in which believers are spoken of as going on to perfection, as having faith and bringing forth its fruits, as not having yet attained; the second what may be called anticipatory, in which the change of state is already fulfilled in them; they are the children of the light, they are one with Christ, and they need only to be awakened to the consciousness of what they truly are. Their final assurance rests rather on looking at what is present or past, than in looking forward to what shall be. Out of this point of view arise practical precepts, the same in substance, though different in form from the preceding.

8. St. Paul goes on to describe the believer under his favourite image of the soldier. This has been already suggested by the mention of watching and sobriety. The weapons with which he is armed are faith, hope, and charity. There is no particular appropriateness in these several figures

by which they are described, which in Ephesians, vi. 11—17., are varied. The word *σωτηρίας* seems to be used with a double allusion:—First, as a continuation of the martial image. Secondly, in a Christian sense, which is more fully drawn out in the succeeding verse.

9. *ὅτι οὐκ ἔθετο*. The connexion turns upon the word *σωτηρία*, “Because God has appointed us unto salvation,” which the Apostle expresses first, negatively, because God has not appointed us for wrath, *i.e.* for punishment, and then positively, but for the attainment of salvation, through our Lord Jesus Christ.

περιποιεῖν = to make anything over; hence *περιποίησις* possession. The words *διὰ τοῦ κυρίου* are to be taken with *περιποίησις σωτηρίας*.

10. *τοῦ ἀποθάνοντος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν*, *who died for us*.] There is a double allusion in this verse:—First, the more general thought so often repeated in the Epistles of St. Paul, of the identification of the Christian with his Lord,

αὐτῷ ζήσωμεν. διὸ παρακαλεῖτε ἀλλήλους, καὶ οἰκοδομεῖτε 11
εἰς τὸν ἕνα, καθὼς καὶ ποιεῖτε.

Ἐρωτῶμεν δὲ ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, εἰδέναι τοὺς κοπιῶντας ἐν 12
ὑμῖν καὶ προϊσταμένους ὑμῶν ἐν κυρίῳ καὶ νουθετοῦντας
ὑμᾶς, καὶ ἡγείσθαι αὐτοὺς ὑπερεκπερισσῶς¹ ἐν ἀγάπῃ διὰ 13
τὸ ἔργον αὐτῶν. εἰρηνεύετε ἐν ἑαυτοῖς. παρακαλοῦμεν δὲ 14
ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, νουθετεῖτε τοὺς ἀτάκτους, παραμυθεῖσθε
τοὺς ὀλιγοψύχους, ἀντέχεσθε τῶν ἀσθενῶν, μακροθυμεῖτε
πρὸς πάντας. ὁρᾶτε μή τις κακὸν ἀντὶ κακοῦ τινὶ ἀποδῶ, 15

¹ ὑπὲρ ἐκ περισσοῦ.

“who died for us, that whether in life or death we may live with him;” which sometimes assumes the relation of opposition, at other times of sameness, either “he died on our behalf that we may live,” or “he died and rose again, that with him also we may die and rise again.” But further, the mode of expression is coloured by what has preceded. Instead of saying, “whether in life or death we may live with him,” the Apostle says, “whether we wake or sleep, we may live with him.” He recalls what he had been saying before. “If we believe that Jesus died and rose again, then also they which *sleep* through Jesus will God bring with him.” He died for us, that it might make no difference whether we live or die, or as it is here expressed, that whether we are awake or asleep, at “his coming we may together live with him.”

ἄμα is to be taken with ζήσωμεν, not with σὺν αὐτῷ.

11. διὸ παρακαλεῖτε] from the context (compare iv. 18) shown to be in the sense of “comfort,” rather than “exhort.” The Apostle, who had half concluded at

the end of the last chapter, here finally terminates the subject of the advent.

12. Ἐρωτῶμεν δέ, *but we beg.*] δὲ is here said to be a particle of transition; or in other words, the adversative form of sentence is so natural to the Greek language, that in later Greek it has altogether lost its adversative force.

εἰδέναι = to recognise, to know who they are.

τοὺς κοπιῶντας] the three expressions all equally denote the elders: (1.) as labourers in the Church; (2.) as its rulers; (3.) as its instructors.

ἐν κυρίῳ] not as a limitation on προϊσταμένους, as though with allusion to other secular rulers, not “in the Lord.” The rulers of the Church rule in the Lord, as the whole Church exists in the Lord, as the believer is said to speak, live, and die in Him. Compare i. 2.

13. καὶ ἡγείσθαι αὐτοὺς ὑπερεκπερισσῶς ἐν ἀγάπῃ; not ἡγείσθαι ἐν ἀγάπῃ, like ἔχειν ἐν ὀργῇ, in Thucyd. ii. 18., to hold them in love. The idiom is smoother and the sense better, if we con-

- 11 with him. Wherefore comfort yourselves together,
and edify one another, even as also ye do.
12 And we beseech you, brethren, to know them which
labour among you, and are over you in the Lord, and
13 admonish you; and to esteem them very highly in love
14 for their work's sake. Be at peace among yourselves.
Now we exhort you, brethren, warn them that are
unruly, comfort the feeble-minded, support the weak,
15 be patient toward all men. See that none render evil

nect ἡγεῖσθαι with ὑπερεκπερισσῶς. "We ask of you to esteem them highly in love, *i.e.* loving them, for their works' sake." In these words is implied the double notion of regard for their authority and love for their persons, as in the expression διὰ τὸ ἔργον is contained a similar two-fold allusion to their office and their labour of love. The tie which binds the believer to the elders of his Church is a mixed one, partly of duty, and partly of affection.

εἰρηνεύετε ἐν ἑαυτοῖς = ἀλλήλοις.] The Apostle following up the train of thought in the preceding verse, adds a second counsel of peace with one another.

14. παρακαλοῦμεν δέ.] For δέ see above, ver. 12. The Apostle continues his exhortation to a performance of Christian duties in general.

τοὺς ἀτάκτους, *unruly*.] Who they were we have no means of knowing, but from the Epistle itself; the same probably, who stood in need of the exhortation in iv. 11.:—"That they should study to be quiet and do their own business, and work with their own hands;" to whom the Apostle again returns in 2 Thess. iii. 12.

ὀλιγοψύχους, ἀσθενῶν, *feeble-*

minded, weak.] Not unconnected with what preceded, as the disorders themselves might have arisen for the weakness of some, or the over-conscientiousness of others, or the anxiety of a third class of persons respecting the state of the departed. If in pagan times evils had arisen from those who had sorrowed without hope and with little thought about the state of the dead, much more would this be likely to be the case where men's hearts were so moved within them and their religious anxieties so intense.

μακροθυμεῖτε πρὸς πάντας.] Compare 1 Cor. xiii.:—ἡ ἀγάπη μακροθυμεῖ. With this is connected the following precept, in which the rule of Christian life is still further generalised.

15. ὁρᾶτε μὴ τις.] These words do not mean, "Take heed one of another;" but "Let each one take heed not to return evil for evil, but everywhere pursue after goodness, both in relation to the brethren and to those without the Church."

It is not strictly true to say that Christianity alone or first forbade to return evil for evil. Plato knew that it was not the true definition of justice to do harm to one's enemies. The

ἀλλὰ πάντοτε τὸ ἀγαθὸν διώκετε εἰς ἀλλήλους καὶ εἰς
 πάντας. πάντοτε χαίρετε, ἀδιαλείπτως προσεύχεσθε, ἐν
 παντὶ εὐχαριστεῖτε· τοῦτο γάρ ἐστιν¹ θέλημα θεοῦ ἐν
 χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ εἰς ὑμᾶς. τὸ πνεῦμα μὴ σβέννυτε, προφη-
 τείας μὴ ἐξουθενεῖτε· πάντα δὲ² δοκιμάζετε, τὸ καλὸν 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21

¹ Omit ἐστιν.² Omit δέ.

Stoics who taught the extirpation of the passions, were far enough from admitting of revenge to be the only one which should be allowed to remain. It is a higher as well as a truer claim to make for the Gospel, that it kindled that spirit of kindness and goodwill in the breast of man (which could not be wholly extinguished even towards an enemy), until it became a practical principle; and that it preached as a rule of life for all, what had previously been the supreme virtue, or the mere theory of philosophers.

τὸ ἀγαθόν, *good*,] in the sense of goodness. The opposite of evil inflicted on another.

16. πάντοτε χαίρετε, *rejoice evermore*.] Philipp. iv. 4. Why should this be a duty? Did St. Paul himself always rejoice? In one sense, yes; as he knew that all things are working together for good. Even in tribulation, as he tells us. He was as sorrowful, yet always rejoicing. So the Christian is to have a better mind of joy, even in sorrow. There is no unmixed evil in this world, and it is his duty to appropriate the good in all things.

17. ἀδιαλείπτως προσεύχεσθε, *pray without ceasing*.] A precept like the last, capable of fulfilment in idea rather than in fact. "It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the letter profiteth nothing." The

true idea of prayer is prayer in Spirit, as the old saying has it, "*laborare est orare*," not the repeating of long prayers, Eph. vi. 18.; but the diligent service of God, and the silent reference of all our actions to him.

18. ἐν παντί, *sc. χρήματι*.] The Apostle adds another precept which may be regarded as uniting in one the last two: — "Give thanks in all things," τοῦτο γάρ θέλημα θεοῦ: compare iv. 3. These may be referred yet further back to the previous precepts as well, rejoice always, pray without ceasing, in everything give thanks. For the will of God is, not that you should sorrow, but that you should be filled with a spiritual joy.

19. τὸ πνεῦμα μὴ σβέννυτε, *quench not the Spirit*.] The first grace which Christians received was like a new spirit, coming down from heaven as it is described in the form of fiery tongues and sitting upon each of them. It was not a power which by long effort they created in themselves; but one which overpowered them, which was already kindled in them, though it might be extinguished. In this passage, the word πνεῦμα, may be regarded as including the spiritual and supernatural gifts which accompanied it.

20. προφητείας μὴ ἐξουθενεῖτε, *despise not prophesyings*.] The essential part of the gift of pro-

for evil unto any man; but ever follow that which is
 16 good, both among yourselves, and to all men. Rejoice
 17 evermore; pray without ceasing; in every thing give
 18 thanks: for this is the will of God in Jesus Christ con-
 19 cerning you. Quench not the Spirit; despise not
 20 prophesyings. But¹ prove all things; hold fast that

¹ *Omit but.*

phesy was, not the foretelling of future events, but the delivery of spiritual oracles. In no place is the term prophet applied to contemporaries of the Apostles, in the modern sense of the word. It was Jeremiah, Ezekiel, &c., the elder prophets only, who foresaw the distant future. Yet prophesying is not exactly synonymous with preaching or teaching. As the gift of tongues required interpretation, so prophecy was subjected to discerners of spirits, 1 Cor. xv. 29.; 1 John, iv. 1. See below, ver. 21. The spirit of prophecy was, or ought to have been self-controlled. Yet even these very words imply that it was also, or was apt to be beyond the prophet's own power. It is impossible not to remember how different such manifestations would be likely to be in an Eastern country, from the forms which they would exhibit among colder tempers. That weakness or imposture would easily mix itself up with them is self-evident, even if it were not indicated in 2 Thess. ii. 2.; 1 John, iv. 1. Hence the Apostle, while exhorting his converts not to despise them, as elsewhere he places them first among spiritual gifts, 1 Cor. xiv. 1., adds in both places the exhortation to try them.

21. 22. The general meaning

of these two verses may be paraphrased thus:—"Discern between good and evil; choose the good, avoid the evil." Yet the English translation, "try all things," naturally suggests thoughts very unlike those of the first century. However apt their application may sound, the true meaning is not "make a rational inquiry into all things." The organ of discernment was of another and a spiritual kind. In 1 Cor. xii. 10., St. Paul speaks of a gift of the discernment of spirits, and it is in a similar connexion the precept occurs hereafter; the Apostle has been speaking of prophecy and of the spirit, as in the Corinthians the discerning of spirits is spoken of with immediate reference to the spiritual gifts. Bearing in mind, that the whole state of the first believers was extraordinary and spiritual, we shall find the meaning in both passages much the same. The distinction of right and wrong, no less than of matters of faith was to them a discerning of spirits. Let us imagine a community of prophets, agitated by every various spiritual impulse yet remaining men of a common nature with ourselves, and liable to mistake merely physical effects for spiritual power; what extravagancies must have been the result, what mixed good and evil

κατέχετε, ἀπὸ παντὸς εἶδους πονηροῦ ἀπέχεσθε. αὐτὸς δὲ ²²
 ὁ θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης ἀγιάσαι ὑμᾶς ὁλοτελεῖς, καὶ ὁλόκληρον ²³
 ὑμῶν τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ καὶ τὸ σῶμα ἀμέμπτως ἐν τῇ
 παρουσίᾳ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ τηρηθείη.
 πιστὸς ὁ καλῶν ὑμᾶς, ὃς καὶ ποιήσει. ²⁴

Ἀδελφοί, προσεύχεσθε [καὶ¹] περὶ ἡμῶν. ἀσπάσασθε ²⁵
 τοὺς ἀδελφούς πάντας ἐν φιλήματι ἀγίῳ. ἐνορκίζω ὑμᾶς ²⁶
 τὸν κύριον, ἀναγνωσθῆναι τὴν ἐπιστολὴν πᾶσιν τοῖς²
 ἀδελφοῖς.

Ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ μεθ' ὑμῶν. ³ ²⁸

¹ Omit καί. ² Add ἀγίοις. ³ πρὸς Θεσσαλονικεῖς πρώτη ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Ἀθηνῶν.

must have blended together under the name of the spirit! To separate and distinguish this among those who held the name of Christ, and yet oftentimes mingled with it the doctrines and spirit of devils, must have been the chief office of a discerner of spirits in the first century. It is this discernment of spirits that is partly spoken of in the words πάντα δοκιμάζετε.

22. ἀπὸ παντὸς εἶδους, *from every kind of evil.*] This is opposed to the previous clause, both together forming subdivisions of πάντα δοκιμάζετε, which is the closing precept: "Try all things; hold fast the good, abstain from evil." The antithesis is natural in a writer so fond of antithesis as St. Paul. Compare Rom. xii. 9—21. The punctuation of Lachmann is therefore

preferable to that of the "Textus Receptus," and of the Authorised Version.

εἶδος = *kind* rather than *appearance*. πονηροῦ, though without the article, is probably a substantive.

23. Still the Apostle is thinking of the coming of Christ, against which he prays that they may be preserved, not only in soul and spirit, but in body. Had he a distinct thought attached to each of these words? Probably not. He is not writing a treatise on the soul, but pouring forth, from the fulness of his heart, a prayer for his converts. Language thus used should not be too closely analysed. His words may be compared to similar expressions among ourselves: *e. g.* "with my heart and soul."

- 22 which is good; abstain from every kind of evil.
 23 And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly, and
 may your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved
 blameless in the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.
 24 Faithful is he that calleth you, who also will do it.
 25 Brethren, pray for us too.¹ Greet all the brethren
 26 with an holy kiss. I charge you by the Lord that
 this epistle be read unto all the² brethren.
 28 The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you.
 Amen.³

¹ Omit *too*.² Add "*holy*."³ The first *Epistle* unto the Thessalonians was written from Athens.

Who would distinguish between the two? Neither did the age in which St. Paul lived admit of any great accuracy in speaking of the human soul; nor does the fluctuating use of such terms in other parts of Scripture imply any precise or exact distinction. Who could define the difference between soul and spirit in the Alexandrian, scholastic, or any other philosophy? least of all should we attempt to do so in Scripture.

24. It is faithfulness on God's part that man perseveres to the end, and yet not unfaithfulness "if some do not believe" (Rom. iii. 3.).

26. So Romans, xvi. 6—16.; 1 Cor. xvi. 16.; 2 Cor. xiii. 12.; but not in the Galatians, nor generally in the later Epistles.

27. A similar direction to this,

viz., to interchange their own Epistle with that to the Laodiceans, is given to the Colossians (Col. iv. 16.). But why does St. Paul use such vehemence of language? did he doubt the good faith of the rulers of the Church? was there some real occasion for a doubt? or was the expression "I conjure you by the Lord" a customary form with him? or is it that he is not completely master of his words, or that they had not such force to him as they have to us? Whatever be the reason, the use of such an expression cannot be regarded as any ground for doubting the genuineness of the Epistle, as the Apostle uses elsewhere strong forms of speech, where they appear to us unnecessary; as, for example, Gal. i. 20.

ON THE BELIEF IN THE COMING OF CHRIST IN THE APOSTOLICAL AGE.

THE belief in the near approach of the coming of Christ is spoken of, or implied, in almost every book of the New Testament, in the discourses of our Lord himself, as well as in the Acts of the Apostles, in the Epistles of St. Paul no less than in the Book of the Revelation. The remains of such a belief are discernible in the Montanism of the second century, which is separated by a scarcely definable line from the Church itself. Nor is there wanting in our own day a dim and meagre shadow of the same primitive faith, though the world appears dead to it, and all things remain the same as at the beginning. There are still those who argue from the very lapse of time, that "now is their salvation nearer than when they believed." All religious men have at times blended in their thoughts, earth and heaven, while there are some who have raised their passing feelings into doctrinal truth, and have seemed to see in the temporary state of the first converts, the type of Christian life in all ages.

The great influence which this belief exercised on the beginnings of the Church, and the degree of influence which it still retains, render the consideration of it necessary for the right understanding of St. Paul's Epistles. Yet it is a subject from which the interpreter of Scripture would gladly turn aside. For it seems as if he were compelled to say at the outset, "that St. Paul was mistaken, and that in support of his mistake he could appeal to the words of Christ himself." Nothing can be plainer than the meaning of those words, and yet they seem to be contradicted by the very fact that, after eighteen centuries, the world is as it was. In the words which are

attributed in the Epistle of St. Peter, to the unbelievers of that day, we might truly say that, since the fathers have fallen asleep, all things remain the same from the beginning. Not only do "all things remain the same;" but the very belief itself (in the sense in which it was held by the first Christians) has been ready to vanish away.

Why, then, were the traces of such a belief permitted to appear in the New Testament? Some will say, "as a trial of our faith;" others will have recourse to the double senses of prophecy, to divide the past from the future, the seen from the unseen. Others will cite its existence as a proof that the books of Scripture were compiled at a time when such a belief was still living, and this not without, but within the circle of the Church itself. It may be also regarded as an indication that we were not intended to interpret Scripture apart from the light of experience, or violently to bend life and truth into agreement with isolated texts. Lastly, so far as we can venture to move such a question of our Lord himself, we may observe that his teaching here, as in other places, is on a level with the modes of thought of his age, clothed in figures, as it must necessarily be, to express "the things that eye hath not seen" limited by time, as if to give the sense of reality to what otherwise would be vague and infinite, yet mysterious in this respect too, for of "that hour knoweth no man;" and that, however, these figures of speech are explained, or these opposite aspects reconciled, their meaning dimly seen has been the stay and hope of the believer in all ages, who knows, nevertheless, that since the Apostles have passed away, all things remain the same from the beginning, and that "the round world is set so fast that it cannot be moved."

The surprise that we naturally feel, when the attention is first called to this singular discrepancy between faith and experience, is greatly lessened, by our observing that even the language of Scripture is not free from inconsistency. For the words of our Lord Himself are not more in apparent contradiction with the course of experience, than they are with other words which are equally attributed to Him by the Evangelists. He who says "This generation

shall not pass away until all these things be fulfilled," is the same as he who tells his disciples—"It is not for you to know the times and the seasons which the Father hath put in his own power," and "of that hour knoweth no man, no not the angels of God, nor the Son, but the Father." Is it reverent, or irreverent, to say that Christ knew what he himself declares "that he did not know"? Is it consistent, or inconsistent, with the language of the Gospels, that the Apostle St. Paul should at first have known no more than our Lord had taught his disciples? or that in the course of years only he should have grown up to another and a higher truth, that "to depart and be with Christ was far better"? Is it strange that, from time to time, he should change his tone, seeming by this very change to say, "whether in the body, or out of the body, I cannot tell;" when our Lord himself at one time speaks of "Jerusalem being encompassed by armies;" at another, gives no other answer to the question, "where Lord?" but, "where the carcase is, there will the eagles be gathered together"? Our conception, both of place and time, becomes indistinct as we enter into the unseen world. And does not the Scripture itself acknowledge these necessary limits of its own revelation to man?

But instead of regarding this or any other fact of Scripture as a difficulty to be explained away, it will be more instructive for us to consider the nature of the belief and its probable effect on the infant communion. Strictly speaking, the expectation of the day of the Lord was not a belief, but a necessity in the early Church; clinging as it did to the thought of Christ, it could not bear to be separated from him; it was his absence, not his presence, that the first believers found it hard to realise. "Yet a little while, and they did not see Him; but yet a little while, and they would again see Him." Nor was it possible for them at once to lay aside the material images in which the faith of prophets and psalmists had clothed the day of the Lord. We readily admit that they lingered around "the elements of the law;" but we must admit also that the imagery of the prophets had a reality and fact to them which it has

not to us, who are taught by time itself, that all these things "are a shadow, but the substance is of Christ."

We naturally ask, Why a future life, as distinct from this, was not made a part of the first preaching of the Gospel? Why, in other words, the faith of the first Christians did not exactly coincide with our own? There are many ways in which the answer to this question may be expressed. The philosopher will say that the difference in the modes of thought of that age and our own, rendered it impossible, humanly speaking, that the veil of sense should be altogether removed. The theologian will admit that Providence does not teach men that which they can teach themselves. While there are lessons which it immediately communicates, there is much which it leaves to be drawn forth by time and events. Experience may often enlarge faith, it may also correct it. No one can doubt that the faith and practice of the early Church, respecting the admission of the Gentiles, were greatly altered by the fact that the Gentiles themselves flocked in; "the kingdom of heaven suffered violence, and the violent took it by force." In like manner, the faith respecting the coming of Christ was modified by the continuance of the world itself. Common sense suggests that those who were in the first ecstasy of conversion, and those who after the lapse of years saw the world unchanged and the fabric of the Church on earth rising around them, could not regard the day of the Lord with the same feelings. While to the one it seemed near and present, at any moment ready to burst forth; to the other it was a long way off, separated by time, and as it were by place, a world beyond the stars, yet strangely enough, also having its dwelling in the heart of man, as it were the atmosphere in which he lived, the mental world by which he was surrounded. Not at once, but gradually did the cloud clear up, and the one mode of faith take the place of the other. Apart from the prophets, though then, beyond them, springing up in a new and living way in the soul of man, corrected by long experience, as the "fathers one by one fell asleep," as the hope of the Jewish race declined, as ecstatic gifts ceased, as a regular hierarchy

was established in the Church, the belief in the coming of Christ was transformed from being outward to becoming inward, from being national to becoming individual and universal, from being Jewish to becoming Christian.

It must be admitted as a fact, that the earliest Christians spoke and thought about the coming of Christ, in a way different from that which prevails among ourselves. Admitting this fact, we have now to consider some of the many aspects of this belief, and its effect on the lives of believers. It is hard for us to define its exact character, because it is hard to conceive a state of the Church, and of the human mind itself, unlike our own. In its origin it was simple and childlike, the belief of men who saw but a little way into the purposes of Providence, who never dreamed of a vista of futurity. It was not what we should term an article of faith, but natural and necessary ; flowing immediately out of the life and state of the earliest believers. It was the feeling of men who looked for the coming of Christ as we might look for the return of a lost friend, many of whom had seen him on earth, and could not believe that he was taken from them for ever. But it was more than this ; it was the feeling of men who had an intense sense of the change that had been wrought in themselves, and to whom this change seemed like the beginning of a greater change that was to spread itself over the world. It was the feeling of men who looked back upon the past, of which they knew so little, and discerned in it the workings of the same spirit, one and continuous, which they felt in their own souls ; to whom the world within and the world without were reflected upon one another, and the history of the Jewish race was a parable, an "open secret," of the things to come. It was the feeling of men, each moment of whose lives was the meeting-point to them of heaven and earth, who scarcely thought either of the past or future in the eternity of the present.

Let those who think this is an imaginary picture, recall to mind and compare with Scripture, either what they may have read in books or experienced in themselves as the workings of a mind sud-

denly converted to the Gospel. Such an one seems to lose his measure of events and his true relation to the world. While other men are going on with their daily occupations, he only is out of sympathy with nature, and has fears and joys in himself, which he can neither communicate nor explain to his fellows. It is not that he is thinking of the endless ages in which he will partake of heavenly bliss; rather the present consciousness of sin, or the present sense of forgiveness and of peace in Christ, is already a sort of hell or heaven within him, which excludes the future. It is not that he has an increased insight into the original meaning of Scripture; rather he seems to absorb Scripture into himself. Least of all have persons in such a state of mind distinct or accurate conceptions of the world to come. The images in which they express themselves are carnal and visible, often inconsistent with each other, if they are uneducated, wanting in good taste, yet not the less the realisation to them of a true and lively faith. The last thing that they desire, or could comprehend, is an intellectual theory of another life. They seem hardly to need either statements of doctrine or the religious ministrations of others; their concern is with God only.

Substitute now for an individual a Church, a nation, the three thousand who were converted on the day of Pentecost, the multitudes of Jews that believed, zealous for the law; imagine them changed at the same instant by one spirit, and we seem to see on a larger scale the same effects following. Their conversion is an exception to the course of nature; itself a revelation and inspiration, a wonder of which they can give no account to themselves or others, not the least wonderful part of which is their communion with one another. They come into existence as a society, with common hopes and fears, at one with each other, separated from mankind at large. What they feel within spreads itself over the world. The good and evil that they are conscious of in themselves, seem to exist without them in aggravated proportions; a fellowship of the saints on one side, and a mystery of iniquity on the other. They do not read history, or comprehend the sort of imperfect necessity under

which men act as creatures of their age. The same guilt which they acknowledge in themselves, they attach to other men ; the same judgment which would await them, is awaiting the world everywhere. In the events around them, in their own sufferings, in their daily life, they see the preparations for the great conflict between good and evil, between Christ and Belial, if, indeed, it be not already begun. The circle of their own life includes in it the destinies of the human race itself, of which it is, as it were, the microcosm, seen by the eye of faith and the light of inward experience. This is what the law and the prophets seemed to them to have meant when they spoke of God's judgments on his enemies, of the Lord coming with ten thousand of his saints. And the signs which were to accompany these things were already seen among them, "not in word only, but in power, and in the Holy Spirit, and in much assurance."

To us the preaching of the Gospel is a new beginning, from which we date all things, beyond which we neither desire nor are able to inquire. To the first believers it was otherwise ; not the beginning of a new world, but the end of a former one. They looked back to the past, because the veil of the future was not yet lifted up. They were living in "the latter days," the confluence of all times, the meeting-point of the purposes of God. They read all things in the light of the approaching end of the world. They were not taught, and could not have imagined, that for eighteen centuries servants of God should continue on the earth, waiting, like themselves, for the promise of his coming. They were not taught, and could not have imagined, that after three centuries the Church which they saw poverty-stricken and persecuted, should be the mistress of the earth, and that, in another sense than they had hoped, the kingdoms of this world should become the kingdoms of the Lord and of his Christ. Instead of it they beheld in a figure the heavens opening; and the angels of God ascending and descending ; the present outpouring of the Spirit, and the evil and perplexity of the world itself, being the earnest of the things which were shortly to come to pass.

It has been often remarked, that the belief in the coming of Christ

stood in the same relation to the Apostolic Church that the expectation of death does to ourselves. Certainly the absence of exhortations based upon the shortness of life, which are not unfrequent in the Old Testament, and are so familiar to our own day, forms a remarkable feature in the writings of the New Testament, and in a measure seems to confirm such an opinion. And yet the similarity is rather apparent than real; or, at any rate, the difference between the two is not less remarkable. For the feeble apprehension which each man entertains of his own mortality, can bear no comparison with that living sense of the day of the Lord which was the habitual thought of the first Christians, which was not so much a "coming" as a "presence" to them, as its very name implied (*παρουσία*). How different also was the event looked for, no less than the anticipation of it! There is nothing terrible in death; it is the repose of wearied nature; it steals men away one by one, while the world goes still on its way. We fear it at a distance, but not near. But the day of the Lord was to be a change, not to the individual only, but to the world; a scene of great fear and great joy at once to the whole Church and to all mankind, which is in its very nature sudden, unexpected, coming "as a thief in the night, and as travail upon a woman with child." Yet it might be said to be expected too, so strange and contradictory is its nature; for the first disciples were sitting waiting for it "with their lamps lighted and their loins girded." It was not darkness, nor sleep, nor death, but a day of light and life, in the expectation of which men were to walk as children of the light, yet fearful by its very suddenness and the vengeance to be poured on the wicked.

Such a belief could not be without its effect on the lives of the first converts and on the state of the Church. While it increased the awfulness of life, it almost unavoidably withdrew men's thoughts from its ordinary duties. It naturally led to the state described in the Corinthian Church, in which spiritual gifts had taken the place of moral duties, and of those very gifts, the less spiritual were preferred to the more spiritual. It took the mind away from the kingdom of God within, to fix it on signs and wonders, "the things

spoken of by the prophet Joel," when the sun should be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood. It made men almost ready to act contrary to the decrees of Cæsar, from the sense of what they saw, or seemed to see, in the world around them. The intensity of the spiritual state in which they lived, so far beyond that of our daily life, is itself the explanation of the spiritual disorder which seems so strange to us in men who were ready to hazard their lives for the truth, and which was but the natural reaction against their former state.

It is obvious that such a belief was inconsistent with an established Ecclesiastical order. A succession of bishops could have had no meaning in a world that was to vanish away. Episcopacy, it has been truly remarked, was in natural antagonism to Montanism; and in the age of the Apostles as well, there is an opposition, traceable in the Epistles themselves, between the supernatural gifts and the order and discipline of the Church. Ecclesiastical as well as political institutions are not made, but grow. What we are apt to regard as their first idea and design, is in reality their after development, what in the fulness of time they become, not what they originally were, the former being faintly, if at all, discernible in the new birth of the Church and of the world.

Nor is it unreasonable to suppose that the meagreness of those historical memorials of the first age which survived it, has been the result of such a belief. What interest would be attached to the events of this world, if they were so soon to be lost in another? or to the lessons of history, when the nations of the earth were in a few years to appear before the judgment-seat of Christ? Even the narrative of the acts and sayings of the Saviour of mankind must have had a different degree of importance to those who expected to see with their eyes the Word of life, and to us, to whom they are the great example, for after ages, of faith and practice. Among many causes which may be assigned for the great historical chasm which separates the life of Christ and his Apostles from after ages, this is not the least probable. The age of the Apostles was an age, not of history, but of prophecy.

PASSAGES IN OTHER EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL ILLUSTRATIVE OF THE BELIEF IN THE COMING OF CHRIST.

1 Cor. i. 7. 8. So that ye came behind in no gift ; waiting for the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ : who shall also confirm you unto the end, that ye may be blameless in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ.

iii. 13. Every man's work shall be made manifest : for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire ; and the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is. (?)

iv. 5. Therefore judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come. (?)

vi. 2. Do ye not know that the saints shall judge the world ?

vii. 29—31. But this I say, brethren, the time is short : it remaineth, that both they that have wives be as though they had none ; and they that weep, as though they wept not ; and they that rejoice, as though they rejoiced not ; and they that buy, as though they possessed not ; and they that use this world, as not abusing it ; for the fashion of this world passeth away.

x. 11. Now all these things happened unto them for ensamples : and they are written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world are come.

xv. 12. Now if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead ?

51. We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed. *Compare Lachmann* :—We shall all sleep, but we shall not all be changed.

2 Cor. i. 14. We are your rejoicing, even as ye also are our's in the day of the Lord Jesus.

iii. 18. But we all, with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord.

2 Cor. v. 1—10. For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. For in this we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven: if so be that, being clothed, we shall not be found naked. For we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened: not for that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life. Now he that hath wrought us for the selfsame thing is God, who also hath given unto us the earnest of the Spirit. Therefore we are always confident, knowing that, whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord: (for we walk by faith, not by sight:) we are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord. Wherefore we labour that, whether present or absent, we may be accepted of him. For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad.

Rom. ii. 15. 16. Their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the mean while accusing or else excusing one another; in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ according to my gospel.

xiii. 11. 12. And that, knowing the time, that now it is high time to awake out of sleep: for now is our salvation nearer than when we believed. The night is far spent, the day is at hand: let us therefore cast off the works of darkness, and let us put on the armour of light.

Eph. i. 3. Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ.

ii. 4—6. But God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ, (by grace ye are saved;) and hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus.

iv. 30. And grieve not the holy Spirit of God, whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption.

Philipp. i. 23. For I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart, and to be with Christ; which is far better.

iii. 11. If by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead.

20. 21. For our conversation is in heaven; from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ: who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself.

iv. 5. Let your moderation be known unto all men. The Lord is at hand.

Col. i. 5. For the hope which is laid up for you in heaven, whereof ye heard before in the word of the truth of the gospel.

12. 13. Giving thanks unto the Father, which hath made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light: who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son.

ON

PALEY'S *HOÆ PAULINÆ*.

FIRST EPISTLE TO THE THESSALONIANS.

No one can read a book on the Evidences of the Christian Religion, written in the last century, without feeling that he has difficulties which are not met by them, and that points of view occur to him, which were not within the scope of vision that presented itself to the writer. This deficiency may be partly accounted for, from their being written in the spirit of the advocate rather than in that of the judge, and consequently making no attempt to consider, as a whole, the objections of antagonists. It also arises from the growth of modern criticism, which had hardly in their day come into contact with the facts of Scripture, and which, as it has gradually crept over the rest of history, begins to approach more and more nearly the sacred territory.

Modern criticism, in the sense here meant, may be described shortly as the spirit of inquiry into historical facts. Its course has been hitherto in some degree to discredit the value of historical testimony, and this in two ways; first, by bringing to light its inconsistencies; and, secondly, by indicating the manner in which, though false, it may without falsehood have sprung up, in the course of nature, by the workings or impressions of the human mind itself.

As the truths of Christianity have an historical as well as a doctrinal part, they cannot be wholly unaffected with that which affects all other history. Fresh suppositions will arise respecting them; discrepancies hitherto unobserved will be detected; what formerly lay flat upon the page of Scripture will be reconstructed with more or less ingenuity or probability into a lively edifice. Some old things will begin to disappear, some new ones to appear. It is natural under

such circumstances for us to turn to our former defenders of the faith, and inquire how far under their protection we can still find a safe abiding place, and how far their human engines have been superseded by new modes of attack.

Paley's *Horæ Paulinæ* has been, and always will be, to our own countrymen one of the greatest bulwarks of historical Christianity. Yet its present value must be in a measure determined by the result of the inquiry which has been just now suggested. We turn over the leaves of the work, not without anxiety to know how much must fall before the subtle shafts of German criticism, how far the author has contemplated the doubts of our own age as well as of his. If the theory against which Paley is contending had been one, not of total, but of partial disbelief, would the arguments which he uses have equally held good? Especially if it had been a theory which attacked the genuineness of the books of Scripture themselves, which dismembered them into parts, and which tended to discredit the external evidence by which they were maintained?

"Though some is taken, much remains." True it is that Paley never contemplated the dismemberment of the books of Scripture, *e.g.* the Acts of the Apostles into original documents; it is true also, that he did not estimate the comparative value of the coincidences which he found in different instances in the same or different writings. All the Epistles and every part of the Acts were placed by him on the same level of authenticity and genuineness. It is true, further, that the very clearness of his style has given him a fallacious advantage with the reader, and that the extreme improbability of the hypothesis which he is combating, leaves an appearance of triumph that would not be justified by anything short of such an hypothesis. Lastly, it may be granted that the omission of many of the discrepancies in the Epistles, and the absence of effort to regard the subject as a whole, and estimate the collective force of objections, place him in the rank of apologists, and not of impartial writers.

But after making all these deductions, it must be conceded that

no author has done as much as Paley in the *Horæ Paulinæ*, to raise up a barrier against unreasoning scepticism, and to place the Epistles on an historical foundation. The ingenuity of his arguments, the minuteness of the intimations discovered by him, the remoteness and complexity of his combinations, leave the impression on the mind, in reference to the great Epistles to the Romans and Corinthians, of absolute certainty and of high probability in reference to most of the others. And even though some of his defences may be untenable, it is true also, that other lines of argument first indicated by him, admit of being carried farther than he has carried them. Such are those from undesigned coincidences of style and of character, that is from similarities which, with a previous knowledge of the style and character of an author, are capable of being recognised and appreciated ; and yet are so latent and complex, that no forger could have invented them.

The two chapters on the Epistle to the Thessalonians contain together nine different heads. Some of them afford the least favourable specimens of Paley's reasoning. All are indebted for a part of their force, to the perspicuity of the writer, which flatters the reader into intelligence, and makes him ready to admit what he can so easily understand. To estimate a criticism on Paley's writings fairly, his arguments and those of his critics should be reduced to their naked form ; otherwise the controversy will insensibly degenerate into a comparison of the styles of two writers, not of the value of their arguments.

Bad reasons on behalf of a received opinion or an established authority, have often hitherto found more favour than good ones against it. But the time has passed for *ex parte* inquiries into the evidences of Christianity, or into any other historical subject. It is the interest of every one to see how we really stand. Let us know the truth, and "the truth will make us free." Without hesitation, therefore, though not without reverence for so great a name, a brief examination will be attempted of that portion of Paley's work which relates to the Epistles to the Thessalonians.

No. I.

"It is known to every reader of Scripture, that the First Epistle to the Thessalonians speaks of the coming of Christ in terms which indicate an expectation of his speedy appearance:—'For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord that *we* which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord, shall not prevent them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first: then *we which are alive and remain*, shall be caught up together with them in the clouds.... But ye, brethren, are not in darkness, that that day should overtake you as a thief.' (iv. 15. 16. 17., v. 4.)

"Whatever other construction these texts may *bear*, the idea they leave upon the mind of an ordinary reader is, that of the author of the Epistle looking for the day of judgment to take place in his own time, or near to it. Now, the use which I make of this circumstance is, to deduce from it a proof that the Epistle itself was not the production of a subsequent age. Would an impostor have given this expectation to St. Paul, after experience had proved it to be erroneous? or would he have put into the Apostle's mouth, or, which is the same thing, into writings purporting to come from his hand, expressions, if not necessarily conveying, at least easily interpreted to convey, an opinion which was then known to be founded in mistake? I state this as an argument to show that the Epistle was cotemporary with St. Paul, which is little less than to show that it actually proceeded from his pen; for I question whether any ancient forgeries were executed in the lifetime of the person whose name they bear, nor was the primitive situation of the Church likely to give birth to such an attempt."

It is argued that no impostor would have put into the mouth of St. Paul, an expectation of the coming of Christ, which experience had shown to be false. Rather say, he would have put into the

mouth of St. Paul anything which it came within the reach of his ingenuity to devise, and which was likely to make the Epistle credited as a genuine work of the Apostle. His general aim would be to support his own opinions by the name and authority of St. Paul. Whether a particular statement was likely to have been made by St. Paul, he would only consider in so far as might seem to affect the verisimilitude of his forgery.

Still the argument holds, if stated differently ; for the impostor must have had an object, and that object or part of that object must have been to spread a belief which was shared by himself in the immediate coming of Christ. In other words, the Epistle must have been written by a Montanist or Millenarian. But a Montanist or Millenarian, believing in the present outpouring of the Spirit, would not have had recourse to the writings of St. Paul in support of his belief. He had himself a witness surer than the written word, and he would have felt the inappropriateness of appealing from the present to the past. No one who had a sufficient motive to forge, would have cared to attach his forgery to the name of an Apostle.

That no ancient forgeries were executed in the lifetime of the person whose name they bear, is more than can be safely affirmed. That forgeries came into existence soon after the death of the person whose name they bear, is certainly proved by the example of the Shepherd of Hermas, the Clementine Homilies, and some of the Apocryphal Gospels. Neither an interval of a hundred years, nor a distance of a hundred miles requires to be interposed. It is certainly true, that the primitive situation of the Church in the year 50, so far as we are acquainted with it, was unlikely to give birth to such an attempt ; that the same improbability would have existed in the year 100, is more than we can maintain.

No. II.

“OUR Epistle concludes with a direction, that it should be publicly read in the Church to which it was addressed :—‘I charge you by the Lord, that this Epistle be read unto all the holy brethren.’ The

existence of this clause in the body of the Epistle is an evidence of its authenticity ; because to produce a letter purporting to have been publicly read in the Church of Thessalonica, when no such letter in truth had been read or heard of in that Church, would be to produce an imposture destructive of itself. At least, it seems unlikely that the author of an imposture would voluntarily, and even officiously, afford a handle to so plain an objection. Either the Epistle was publicly read in the Church of Thessalonica during St. Paul's lifetime, or it was not. If it was, no publication could be more authentic, no species of notoriety more unquestionable, no method of preserving the integrity of the copy more secure. If it was not, the clause we produce would remain a standing condemnation of the forgery, and one would suppose, an invincible impediment to its success.

“If we connect this article with the preceding, we shall perceive that they combine into one strong proof of the genuineness of the Epistle. The preceding article carries up the date of the Epistle to the time of St. Paul ; the present article fixed the publication of it to the Church of Thessalonica. Either, therefore, the Church of Thessalonica was imposed upon by a false Epistle, which in St. Paul's lifetime they received and read publicly as his, carrying on a communication with him all the while, and the Epistle referring to the continuance of that communication ; or other Christian Churches, in the same lifetime of the Apostle, received an Epistle purporting to have been publicly read in the Church of Thessalonica, which nevertheless had not been heard of in that Church ; or lastly, the conclusion remains, that the Epistle now in our hands is genuine.”

Nothing can be apparently more conclusive than than this statement, though really fallacious. The root of the fallacy seems to lie in the supposition that the moment the forged writing appeared, it would be subject to critical investigation, and that the first place it would be brought to would be the Church of Thessalonica itself. Whereas, the whole history of forgeries shows that they wandered

about the world, coming and going nobody knew whence or whither, and that the concealment of their origin was not an impediment to their success. The Epistle to the Thessalonians, we will suppose, suddenly made its appearance at Rome or Alexandria, in the year 120. It fell, as its author intended, into the hands of those who were predisposed to its doctrine and gladly caught at its authority. Would any one think of writing to the Church of Thessalonica to ask whether the Epistle had been read there during St. Paul's lifetime? And if we could suppose such an inquiry to be made after an interval of fifty years or more, who could say whether it had or had not been once read, in accordance with the Apostle's direction? A parallel case will throw light on the question which we are considering. Suppose a lost book of statutes to re-appear suddenly, would it be thought to militate against its genuineness that a provision was found in it that the whole book should be read once a year? And suppose, further, this book to be a forgery, would the occurrence of such a provision tend to create the slightest suspicion respecting it? Would it have been any reason for doubting the genuineness of the Book of the Law, in Josiah's time, that it contained a command that it should be read by the king?

It is highly improbable, as Paley remarks, that the Church of Thessalonica could have been imposed upon by a false Epistle in St. Paul's lifetime; but there is no improbability in the circumstance that other Churches and individuals may have read, not perhaps during the lifetime of the Apostle, but soon after, an Epistle purporting to be addressed to the Church of Thessalonica, which nevertheless had not been heard of in that Church, and that such Epistle may have been gradually received as genuine; and therefore it is by other arguments than these that the conclusion must be proved, that the Epistle now in our hands is genuine.

No. III.

“BETWEEN our Epistle and the history the accordancy in many points is circumstantial and complete. The history relates, that

after Paul and Silas had been beaten with many stripes at Philippi, shut up in the inner prison, and their feet made fast in the stocks, as soon as they were discharged from their confinement, they departed from thence, and, when they had passed through Amphipolis and Apollonia, came to Thessalonica, where Paul opened and alleged that Jesus was the Christ, Acts, xvi. 23—xvii. 1—3. The Epistle written in the name of Paul and Sylvanus (Silas), and of Timotheus, who also appears to have been along with them at Philippi (*vide* Phil. No. IV.) speaks to the Church of Thessalonica thus: ‘Even after that we had suffered before, and were shamefully entreated, as ye know, at Philippi, we were bold in our God to speak unto you the Gospel of God with much contention.’ ii. 2.

“The history relates, that after they had been some time at Thessalonica, ‘The Jews which believed not . . . set all the city on an uproar, and assaulted the house of Jason (where Paul and Silas were), and sought to bring them out to the people.’ Acts, xvii. 5. The Epistle—declares ‘When we were with you, we told you before that we should suffer tribulation; even *as it came to pass, and ye know.*’ iii. 4.

“The history brings Paul and Silas and Timothy together at Corinth, soon after the preaching of the Gospel at Thessalonica: ‘And when Silas and Timotheus were come from Macedonia (to Corinth), Paul was pressed in spirit.’ Acts, xviii. 5. The Epistle is written in the name of these three persons, who consequently must have been together at that time, and speaks throughout of their ministry at Thessalonica as a recent transaction: ‘We, brethren, *being taken from you for a short time* in presence, not in heart, endeavoured the more abundantly to see your face with great desire.’ ii. 17.

“The harmony is indubitable; but the points of history in which it consists, are so expressly set forth in the narrative, and so directly referred to in the Epistle, that it becomes necessary for us to show, that the facts in one writing were not copied from the other. Now, amidst some minuter discrepancies, which will be noticed below, there is one circumstance which mixes itself with all the allusions in

the Epistle, but does not appear in the history anywhere; and that is of a visit which St. Paul had intended to pay to the Thessalonians during the time of his residing at Corinth: 'Wherefore we would have come unto you, even I Paul, once and again; but Satan hindered us.' ii. 18. 'Night and day praying exceedingly that we might see your face, and might perfect that which is lacking in your faith. Now God himself and our Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ, direct our way unto you.' iii. 10. 11. Concerning a design which was not executed, although the person himself, who was conscious of his own purpose, should make mention in his letters, nothing is more probable than that his historian should be silent, if not ignorant. The author of the Epistle could not, however, have learnt this circumstance from the history, for it is not there to be met with; nor if the historian had drawn his materials from the Epistle, is it likely that he would have passed over a circumstance, which is amongst the most obvious and prominent of the facts to be collected from that source of information."

The harmony is indubitable; nor is there any reason for supposing that the writer of the Acts has taken his materials from the Epistle, or the writer of the Epistle from the Acts; but the omission, not of a fact but of an intention in the Epistle, by the author of the Acts cannot be considered as any additional proof of that which hardly needs to be proved at all.

No. IV.

"'WHEREFORE, when we could no longer forbear, we thought it good to be left at Athens alone; and sent Timotheus, our brother, and minister of God, to establish you, and to comfort you concerning your faith: . . . but now when Timotheus came from you unto us, and brought us good tidings of your faith and charity, . . . we were comforted over you in all our affliction and distress by your faith.' iii. 1—7.

“The history relates, that when Paul came out of Macedonia to Athens, Silas and Timothy stayed behind at Berea :— ‘The brethren sent away Paul to go as it were to the sea ; but Silas and Timotheus abode there still. And they that conducted Paul brought him to Athens.’ Acts, xvii. 14. 15. The history farther relates, that after Paul had tarried some time at Athens, and had proceeded from thence to Corinth, whilst he was exercising his ministry in that city Silas and Timothy came to him from Macedonia, Acts, xviii. 5. But to reconcile the history with the clause in the Epistle which makes St. Paul say— ‘We thought it good to be left at Athens alone ; and sent Timotheus unto you,’ it is necessary to suppose that Timothy had come up with St. Paul at Athens ; a circumstance which the history does not mention. I remark, therefore, that although the history does not expressly notice this arrival, yet it contains intimations which render it extremely probable that the fact took place :— First, as soon as Paul had reached Athens, he sent a message back, to Silas and Timothy ‘for to come to him with all speed.’ Acts, xvii. 15. Secondly, his stay at Athens was on purpose that they might join him there : ‘Now while Paul *waited for them at Athens*, his spirit was stirred in him.’ Acts, xvii. 16. Thirdly, his departure from Athens does not appear to have been in any sort hastened, or abrupt. It is said, ‘after these things,’ viz. his disputation with the Jews, his conferences with the philosophers, his discourse at Areopagus, and the gaining of some converts, he ‘departed from Athens, and came to Corinth.’ Acts, xviii. 1. It is not hinted that he quitted Athens before the time that he had intended to leave it ; it is not suggested that he was driven from thence, as he was from many cities, by tumults or persecutions, or because his life was no longer safe. Observe then the particulars which the history *does* notice ; that Paul had ordered Timothy to follow him without delay, that he waited at Athens on purpose that Timothy might come up with him, that he stayed there as long as his own choice led him to continue. Laying these circumstances, which the history does disclose, together, it is highly probable that Timothy came to the Apostle at

Athens; a fact which the Epistle, we have seen, virtually asserts, when it makes Paul send Timothy back from Athens to Thessalonica. The *sending back of Timothy into Macedonia* accounts also for his not coming to Corinth till after Paul had been fixed in that city for some considerable time. Paul had found out Aquila and Priscilla, abode with them and wrought, being of the same craft; and reasoned in the synagogue every sabbath day, and persuaded the Jews and the Greeks. Acts, xviii. 1—5. All this passed at Corinth before Silas and Timotheus were come from Macedonia. Acts, xviii. 5. If this was the first time of their coming up with him after their separation at Berœa, there is nothing to account for a delay so contrary to what appears from the history itself to have been St. Paul's plan and expectation. This is a conformity of a peculiar species. The Epistle discloses a fact which is not preserved in the history; but which makes what is said in the history more significant, probable, and consistent. The history bears marks of an omission; the Epistle by reference furnishes a circumstance which supplies that omission."

Here the discrepancy turns on the circumstance that, according to the Epistle, Timothy joined the Apostle at Athens; but according to the narrative of the Acts, at Corinth. The undesigned coincidence is supposed to consist in the omission, in the Acts, of the return of Timothy from Athens to Thessalonica, which is thought to be intimated, however, in the command of Paul, that they should come speedily to him, which command, unless we assume such a journey, must have been neglected.

Paley has here lost sight of the natural view of the narrative of the Acts. For no one would have found there the shadow of inconsistency, but for the discrepancy with the Thessalonians. Let us see how the case stands: — Paul waited for Timothy and Silas at Athens, not because he expected that they would come up with him there, but because he expected them somewhere. The length of his stay, either

at Athens or Corinth before he was overtaken by Silas and Timotheus, cannot really be inferred from the narrative. And even granting that the narrative does seem to imply an interval of a few weeks in which St. Paul was alone, sufficient time must also be allowed for the messengers of Paul to go from Athens to Berea, and for Timothy to return from Berea to Athens. And, lastly, suppose that for some reason unknown, Timothy and Silas were delayed, does it follow that, unless the delay were considerable, the author of the Acts would necessarily have mentioned so minute a circumstance?

But for the sake of argument, let us admit the inconsistency to exist, which Paley assumes to have discovered in the Acts, and what must be the inference? It must be admitted, that the writer of the Acts either knew, or did not know, that the return of Timothy from Athens to Thessalonica actually took place. If he did know, it would be unnatural for him to have expressed himself as he has done respecting the circumstance of Timothy and Silas overtaking the Apostle at Corinth. But if he did not know, the intimations themselves vanish. For in using these words, "Whilst Paul waited for them at Athens" he sent a message back to Silas and Timothy, "to come to him with all speed." Paley supposes him to be saying something, the bearing of which he did not perceive; to have spoken, not of himself, but on the authority of some other writing or narrative which he misunderstood or misquoted. But it is not likely that, with a narrative before him which contained a succinct account of the facts, the compiler should have retained these intimations, and have omitted the very circumstance which was necessary to make them consistent with the rest of his history.

Our inference, therefore, must be that the method of meeting the supposed inconsistency proposed by Paley, while it assumes the inconsistency for the sake of meeting it, leads into a further anomaly.

Once more, Paley does not observe that, even admitting his hypothesis, a discrepancy still remains; because in the Epistle which is addressed from Paul and Silvanus and Timotheus, only Timothy is spoken of as sent from Athens; whereas, to reconcile the Epistle

with the Acts, Silas as well as Timothy must have undertaken the double journey.

The possible hypotheses respecting this subject are the following:—

1. Timothy and Silas, having been left behind at Berea (according to the Acts), join the Apostle at Athens (not according to the Acts).

2. Silas, who alone is mentioned in the Acts as having preached at Thessalonica and Berea, is left behind at Berea, and Timothy follows the Apostle to Athens, whence he is sent back by him to Thessalonica. We may further suppose, Timothy and Silas returning together from Thessalonica to Corinth, and then overtaking the Apostle. This mode of explaining the two accounts reduces the discrepancy to a minimum. The writer of the Acts knew that Silas and Timotheus were together at Thessalonica and Berea, and were together when they overtook the Apostle at Corinth; what he did not know, was only that they were separated during the interval.

3. Another mode of escape is, to avail ourselves of the usual resource of harmonists, and repeat the event. The Epistle must then have a later date assigned to it. But a date, either long after the Apostle's sojourn, or implying the interposition of a visit from Timothy, is inconsistent with the contents of the Epistle itself.

4. Or possibly by the words "we thought it good to be left at Athens alone; and sent Timotheus," in the Epistle (iii. 1. 2.), may be meant, only sent Timotheus from Berea; a sense just admissible in the words, but hardly consistent with the context.

Whichever way of diminishing the difficulty be adopted, it still remains slight, but unexplainable, and cannot be by any ingenuity converted into an undesigned coincidence. Any mode of explanation which, like Paley's, does away the natural meaning of the author of the Acts, or like No. IV. of the Epistle, which dives beneath the surface to pick up what is really on the surface, is in its tendency far more dangerous than the simple admission of the existence of a discrepancy, because it introduces into Scripture a hypercritical and unreal method of interpretation, which may be anywhere made the instrument of perverting the meaning of the text.

No. V.

“‘FOR ye, brethren, became followers, of the churches of God which in Judea are in Christ Jesus: for ye also have suffered like things *of your own countrymen*, even as they have of the Jews.’ ii. 14.

“To a reader of the Acts of the Apostles it might seem, at first sight, that the persecutions which the preachers and converts of Christianity underwent, were suffered at the hands of their old adversaries the Jews. But if we attend carefully to the accounts there delivered, we shall observe that, though the opposition made to the Gospel usually *originated* from the enmity of the Jews, yet in almost all places the Jews went about to accomplish their purpose, by stirring up the Gentile inhabitants against their converted countrymen. Out of Judea they had not power to do much mischief in any other way. This was the case at Thessalonica in particular: ‘The Jews which believed not, moved with envy, set all the city in an uproar.’ Acts, xvii. 5. It was the same a short time afterwards at Berea: ‘When the Jews of Thessalonica had knowledge that the word of God was preached of Paul at Berea, they came thither also, and stirred up the people.’ Acts, xvii. 13. And before this, our Apostle had met with a like species of persecution, in his progress through the Lesser Asia: in every city ‘The unbelieving Jews stirred up the Gentiles, and made their minds evil affected against the brethren.’ Acts, xiv. 2. The Epistle therefore represents the case accurately as the history states it. It was the Jews always who set on foot the persecutions against the Apostles and their followers. He speaks truly therefore of them, when he says in this Epistle, they ‘both killed the Lord Jesus, and their own prophets, and have *persecuted us*; . . . forbidding us to speak unto the Gentiles.’ ii. 15. 16. But out of Judea it was at the hands of the Gentiles, it was ‘of their own countrymen,’ that the injuries they underwent were immediately sustained: ‘Ye have suffered like things of your own countrymen, even as they have of the Jews.’”

This is not a fair representation of the circumstances referred to. It is true, that on several occasions the Jews stirred up the Gentiles to persecute the first believers. It is true also that, according to one reading, see No. VI., of a passage in the Acts (xvii. 4.), Gentiles may be included. But still the main difficulty cannot be thus disposed of. That difficulty arises from the discrepancy of the Acts and the Epistle; the first impression of the Acts being that the converts of Thessalonica were Jews persecuted by Jews, or at any rate that the element of Jews and proselytes was a principal one in the Church, and the Jews actively engaged in the persecution, or rather the main authors of it; while the only construction that can be put upon the Epistle is, that they were Greeks persecuted by Greeks. This discrepancy might find a reconciliation, were we more fully acquainted with the circumstances of the case, but cannot be regarded as an undesigned coincidence. Compare *Horæ Paulinæ*, chap. v. No. V.

No. VI.

“THE apparent discrepancies between our Epistle and the history, though of magnitude sufficient to repel the imputation of confederacy or transcription (in which view they form a part of our argument), are neither numerous, nor very difficult to reconcile.

“One of these may be observed in the ninth and tenth verses of the second chapter:—‘For ye remember, brethren, our labour and travail: for labouring night and day, because we would not be chargeable unto any of you, we preached unto you the gospel of God. Ye are witnesses, and God also, how holily and justly and unblameably we behaved ourselves among you that believe.’ A person who reads this passage is naturally led by it to suppose that the writer had dwelt at Thessalonica for some considerable time; yet of St. Paul’s ministry in that city, the history gives no other account than the following:—That ‘they came to Thessalonica, where was a synagogue of the Jews;’ that, ‘as his manner was, he went in unto them, and *three sabbath days* reasoned with them out of the Scriptures;’ . . . that

‘some of them believed, and consorted with Paul and Silas.’ The history then proceeds to tell us, that ‘the Jews which believed not . . . set all the city on an uproar, and assaulted the house of Jason,’ where Paul and his companions lodged; that the consequence of this outrage was, that ‘the brethren immediately sent away Paul and Silas by night unto Berea.’ Acts, xvii. 1—10. From the mention of his preaching three sabbath days in the Jewish synagogue, and from the want of any farther specification of his ministry, it has usually been taken for granted that Paul did not continue at Thessalonica more than three weeks. This, however, is inferred without necessity. It appears to have been St. Paul’s practice, in almost every place that he came to, upon his first arrival to repair to the synagogue. He thought himself bound to propose the Gospel to the Jews *first*, agreeably to what he declared at Antioch in Pisidia; ‘it was necessary that the word of God should first have been spoken to you.’ Acts, xiii. 46. If the Jews rejected his ministry, he quitted the synagogue, and betook himself to a Gentile audience. At Corinth, upon his first coming thither, he reasoned in the synagogue every sabbath; ‘and when the Jews opposed themselves, and blasphemed, he departed thence,’ expressly telling them, ‘from henceforth I will go unto the Gentiles. . . . And he continued there a year and six months.’ Acts, xviii. 6—11. At Ephesus, in like manner, for the space of three months he went into the synagogue; but when divers were hardened and believed not, but spake evil of that way, he departed from them and separated the disciples, disputing daily in the school of one Tyrannus; and this continued by the space of two years. Acts, xix. 8. 9. 10. Upon inspecting the history, I see nothing in it which negatives the supposition that St. Paul pursued the same plan at Thessalonica which he adopted in other places; and that, though he resorted to the synagogue only three sabbath days, yet he remained in the city, and in the exercise of his ministry amongst the Gentile citizens, much longer, and until the success of his preaching had provoked the Jews to excite the tumult and insurrection by which he was driven away.

"Another seeming discrepancy is found in the ninth verse of the first chapter of the Epistle:— 'For they themselves show of us what manner of entering in we had unto you, and how *ye turned to God from idols* to serve the living and true God; and to wait for his Son from heaven, whom he raised from the dead, even Jesus, which delivered us from the wrath to come.' This text contains an assertion that, by means of St. Paul's ministry at Thessalonica, many idolatrous Gentiles had been brought over to Christianity. Yet the history, in describing the effects of that ministry, only says, that 'some of the Jews believed, . . . and of the devout Greeks a great multitude, and of the chief women not a few.' Acts, xvii. 4. The devout Greeks were those who already worshipped the one true God; and therefore could not be said, by embracing Christianity 'to be turned to God from idols.'

"This is the difficulty. The answer may be assisted by the following observations. The Alexandrian and Cambridge manuscripts read (for τῶν τε σεβομένων Ἑλλήνων πολὺ πλῆθος) τῶν τε σεβομένων καὶ Ἑλλήνων πολὺ πλῆθος. In which reading they are also confirmed by the Vulgate Latin. And this reading is in my opinion strongly supported by the considerations:—First, that οἱ σεβόμενοι alone, *i.e.* without Ἕλληνες, is used in this sense in this same chapter, Paul being come to Athens, διελέγετο μὲν οὖν ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις καὶ τοῖς σεβομένοις. Secondly, that σεβόμενοι and Ἕλληνες nowhere come together. The expression is redundant. The οἱ σεβόμενοι must be Ἕλληνες. Thirdly, that the καὶ is much more likely to have been left out, *incuria manus*, than to have been put in.

"Or, after all, if we be not allowed to change the present reading, which is undoubtedly retained by a great plurality of copies, may not the passage in the history be considered as describing only the effects of St. Paul's discourses during the three sabbath days in which he preached in the synagogue? and may it not be true, as we have remarked above, that his application to the Gentiles at large, and his success amongst them, was posterior to this?"

The Epistle says, that the Apostle laboured with his own hands, ii. 9. 10., implying, therefore, that he remained there for some time. But the Acts state that he preached (at Thessalonica) three sabbath days. Paley argues "but he may have stayed there longer, because he did so in other places." But this is not the spirit of the narrative; nothing can be inferred from what he did at other places where he was not driven out by persecution, from what he did at this where he was. It might be argued, however, in favour of the genuineness of the Epistle, that its account is indirectly confirmed by the Philippians, in which it is stated, that in Thessalonica they sent once and again to the Apostle's necessity.

The fallacy of Paley's argument lies in the rejection of the *primâ facie* meaning of the Acts. St. Paul may have stayed longer, and may have converted Gentiles; but would the author of the Acts have expressed himself as he has done, had he been aware of this protracted stay? That is the point which is not in any degree met by accumulating instances that may tend to prove his practice in other places. Paley's mode of dealing with these passages is as if in ordinary conversation we took the words of a truth-speaking person, and made them mean anything they could mean without involving the speaker in positive falsehood, giving, moreover, as the reason for our tortuous interpretation of them that he had so expressed himself at other times. A better answer would be: (1.) That the Apostle, even though he remained in a place but for three weeks, began by giving a specimen of his way of life. (2.) That it by no means follows that he intended to remain but for three weeks, as the duration of his stay was cut short by the stirring up of persecution.

The second discrepancy Paley seeks to avoid by adopting the reading τῶν τε σεβομένων καὶ Ἑλλήνων. Granting him this, it will still not enable us to account for the exclusively Gentile character of the Church in the Epistle.

SECOND EPISTLE TO THE THESSALONIANS.

No. I.

“It may seem odd to allege obscurity itself as an argument, or to draw a proof in favour of a writing, from that which is usually considered as the principal defect in its composition. The present Epistle, however, furnishes a passage, hitherto unexplained, and probably inexplicable by us, the existence of which, under the darkness and difficulties that attend it, can only be accounted for upon the supposition of the Epistle being genuine; and upon that supposition is accounted for with great ease. The passage which I allude to is found in the second chapter of the Second Epistle (ver. 3—8.) :—‘That day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God. Remember ye not, that WHEN I WAS YET WITH YOU, I TOLD YOU THESE THINGS? *And now ye know what withholdeth that he might be revealed in his time.* For the mystery of iniquity doth already work: *only he who now letteth will let, until he be taken out of the way.* And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming.’ It were superfluous to prove, because it is in vain to deny, that this passage is involved in great obscurity, more especially the clauses distinguished by Italics. Now, the observation I have to offer, is founded upon this, that the passage expressly refers to a conversation which the author had previously holden with the Thessalonians upon the same subject :—‘Remember ye not, that, when I was yet with you, *I told you these things? And now ye know what withholdeth.*’ If such conversation actually passed; if whilst he was yet with them, he *told* them, ‘these things,’ then it follows that the Epistle is authentic. And of the reality of this conversation it appears to be a proof, that what is said in the

Epistle might be understood by those who had been present at such conversation, and yet be incapable of being explained by any other. No man writes unintelligibly on purpose. But it may easily happen, that a part of a letter which relates to a subject, upon which the parties had conversed together before, which refers to what had been before *said*, which is in truth a portion or continuation of a former discourse, may be utterly without meaning to a stranger who should pick up the letter upon the road, and yet be perfectly clear to the person to whom it is directed, and with whom the previous communication had passed. And if, in a letter which thus accidentally fell into my hands, I found a passage expressly referring to a former conversation, and difficult to be explained without knowing that conversation, I should consider this very difficulty as a proof that the conversation had actually passed, and consequently that the letter contained the real correspondence of real persons."

Paley says, that "no man writes unintelligibly on purpose," and therefore there must have been some real conversation, which is here referred to. But is not this a fallacy? He appears in this article to confuse the forger and the real author. That the real author could not have written unintelligibly on purpose is true; but it by no means follows that the forger would not have taken any mode which his ingenuity suggested of making his work appear to be a genuine writing. (See chap. ix. No. I.) He might have referred to pretended conversations, letters, &c., with this object. He might have written whatever St. Paul could have written; the only limit to this being whether the verisimilitude was of a kind which was likely to occur to him. The question which he would ask himself would be, not whether what he wrote was unintelligible, but whether any suspicion would be aroused by its unintelligibleness. It may easily happen, as Paley observes, that part of a letter may be unintelligible from want of information respecting allusions contained in it. But this is no confirmation of its truth. A. B. forges letters

tending to prove he is the heir to an estate; in these letters he alludes to matters which from his statement of them can only be half understood. This may be some proof of the ingenuity of the forger; it is no proof of the genuineness of the letters.

No. II.

“‘NEITHER did we eat any man’s bread for nought; but wrought with labour and travail night and day, that we might not be chargeable to any of you: not because we have not power, but to make ourselves an ensample unto you to follow us.’ iii. 8. 9.

“In a letter, purporting to have been written to another of the Macedonic Churches, we find the following declaration:—

“‘Now ye Philippians know also, that in the beginning of the gospel, when I departed from Macedonia, *no church communicated with me as concerning giving and receiving, but ye only.*’ iv. 15. .

“The conformity between these two passages is strong and plain. They confine the transaction to the same period. The Epistle to the Philippians refers to what passed ‘in the beginning of the Gospel,’ that is to say, during the first preaching of the Gospel on that side of the Ægean sea. The Epistle to the Thessalonians speaks of the Apostle’s conduct in that city upon ‘his first entrance in unto them,’ which the history informs us was in the course of his first visit to the peninsula of Greece.

“As St. Paul tells the Philippians, that no church communicated with him as concerning giving and receiving, but they only, he could not, consistently with the truth of this declaration, have received anything from the neighbouring Church of Thessalonica. What thus appears by general implication in an Epistle to another Church, when he writes to the Thessalonians themselves, is noticed expressly and particularly: ‘Neither did we eat any man’s bread for nought; but wrought night and day, that we might not be chargeable to any of you.’

“The texts here cited farther also exhibit a mark of conformity with what St. Paul is made to say of himself in the Acts of the

Apostles. The Apostle not only reminds the Thessalonians that he had not been chargeable to any of them, but he states likewise the motive which dictated this reserve :— ‘ Not because we have not power, but to make ourselves an ensample unto you to follow us, iii. 9. This conduct, and what is much more precise, the end which he had in view by it, was the very same as that which the history attributes to St. Paul in a discourse, which it represents him to have addressed to the elders of the church of Ephesus :— ‘ Yea, ye yourselves know, that these hands have ministered unto my necessities, and to them that were with me. I have *showed* you all things, how *that so labouring ye ought to support the weak.*’ Acts, xx. 34. 35. The sentiment in the Epistle and in the speech is in both parts of it so much alike, and yet the words which convey it show so little of imitation or even of resemblance, that the agreement cannot well be explained without supposing the speech and the letter to have really proceeded from the same person.”

Paley should not have omitted the verse following (Phil. iv. 16.), which implies that St. Paul received support from the Philippians while at Thessalonica, and is therefore partly inconsistent with his working with his own hands. “For even in Thessalonica ye sent once and again unto my necessities.”

[No. III. is not reprinted, as the subject of it has been already anticipated in the notes on the passage referred to.]

The defects of Paley’s article on the Thessalonians may be summed up as follows :— He has no distinctive conception of the nature or origin of early forgeries. He tends to confuse the person of the forger with the real author, and argues erroneously from one to the other. He omits discrepancies. He alters the natural and *primâ facie* meaning of the Acts and the Epistles. He finds difficulties

where there are none, for the sake of introducing undesigned coincidences. He has worked out in separate details, a subject which can only be regarded philosophically as a whole, in which probabilities have to be considered, not singly, but collectively and with reference to the entire circumstances of the early Church.

It would be very unjust to Paley to suppose that his whole work contains no stronger arguments than those which have been reviewed. Led away by his own ingenious thought of "undesigned coincidences," he has sought to find them where they did not exist; he has impressed the notion of them on his own mind and that of the reader as a sort of form, by the help of which the Acts and the Epistles are to be read; they are to be looked for everywhere, and therefore will be found everywhere. The very number of coincidences which he discovers is antecedently improbable, in writings so short and so slightly connected as the Acts and the Epistles.

Still more erroneous would it be to suppose that the real evidence for the Epistles to the Thessalonians is at all weakened by their omission. Far stronger and deeper is that evidence which is derived from the style and character of the Epistle which in almost every verse recalls the manner of the Apostle St. Paul, and which in spite of minor discrepancies finds a general support and broad foundation in the agreement of the Epistle with the main features of the narrative of the Acts.

SECOND EPISTLE
TO
THE THESSALONIANS.

THE

SECOND EPISTLE TO THE THESSALONIANS.

INTRODUCTION.

THE Second Epistle to the Thessalonians may be regarded in two points of view:—(1.) as continuing the First Epistle; (2.) as diverging from it, and in one respect at least, forming a link of transition to the later Epistles. It defers the Advent of Christ, and yet presents a more vivid and detailed account of the manner and circumstances of it. More fully in the Apostle's mind, nevertheless, in its outward manifestation, it seems to remove further from him, the intervening objects overshadowing the distant vision. The very definiteness with which he conceives it, leads him, as it were, a step onward, to consider the stages of its revelation, to ask the question, not "when shall these things be, and the end of the world?" but what will happen first?

It was thought by Grotius that what is termed the Second Epistle must have preceded the First. Improbable as it is (comp. 2 Thess. ii. 15.) that a previous Epistle could have interposed itself between the visit of the Apostle and chapters two and three of the First Epistle, and inconsistent as 1 Thess. iv. 13—18. would then be with 2 Thess. ii. the opinion may serve to remind us that, in one sense it is true that the Second Epistle anticipates the first; that is to say, it is based on the lesson which the Apostle had taught the Thessalonians, while he was yet with them, and previously to either, ii. 5. The subject of Antichrist was not new to them; they had been told who was meant, and what withheld that he should be revealed in his own

time. Whereas, in the former Epistle, he had led their minds exclusively to the heavenly vision, "the saints meeting in the air with Christ, and the dead whom he would bring with him."

Something like a definite object is indicated in the second chapter of the Epistle. That object seems to have been to inform the converts, or rather to remind them of what they already knew, respecting the coming of Christ and the previous revelation of Antichrist, and "that which let." It might, indeed, be questioned here, as in Rom. ix. to xi. compared with i.—viii., whether the first chapter is introductory to the second, or the second supplementary to the first. But the particularity of the second chapter, and the nearness of that "which already worketh," as well as the earnestness of the Apostle's language, tend to show that what is in form subordinate, is really the centre of the Epistle. As in 1 Cor. x. the thought which is nearest the Apostle's heart, is overlaid with what is merely introductory to it.

But whether there be or not any doubt about the primary object of the Epistle, the mind and feelings with which the Apostle wrote are plainly impressed upon it, and hardly less so the state of the Church to which it was addressed. The aspect in which the Gospel presented itself to the Apostle, was not unlike that in which it was described by John the Baptist; "He shall burn up the chaff with fire unquenchable." Within the Church it might be possible to think only of the elect, whose prayers and hopes seemed to bring the day of the Lord nearer and nearer, until the horizon of earth melted away in the clouds of heaven. But it was impossible to turn away the sight from the aspect of the world itself, especially that portion of it which was on the confines of the Church, whether the Jewish persecutors, who harassed the Apostle in every city, "who pleased not God, and were contrary to man," or the wild forms of heresy or licentiousness, which at one moment seemed to set themselves with giant force to arrest his course; at another time, by seductive influences to steal away the hearts of his converts. In the distance, too, were the heathen world mingling in the vision of sin; ripe for

the revelation of wrath, no less than for the revelation of mercy. (Compare Rom. i. 8.)

The whole of the Epistle, like the Epistles of the imprisonment, is written under what may be termed "the feeling of persecution;" that is to say, the sense of resignation, on the one hand, to the present will of God; on the other hand, a sure and certain hope that "times of refreshment" were at hand. Such was, not only the feeling of the Apostle himself, but also that which he implies the existence of, in the Church to which he was writing. Sadness and consolation, hope and fear, the vision of glory and of terror, were present with them or passing before them. They were not living the common life of other men; they did not see with the eyes of other men.

A life thus divided between this world and another, was naturally liable to become a life of excitement and disorder. Times of persecution needed extraordinary religious supports; the withdrawal of those supports, the momentary clouding of the heaven above, would from time to time lead to reaction. Those who sat "waiting for the day of the Lord," and in this very expectation perhaps neglecting their employments, had lost that quietness of mind which is given by daily occupation. The perils of such a state were not unknown to the Apostle. It might at any time pass into its opposite, the very good that was in it becoming only material of evil. Half organised as the Church was then, the only means of avoiding such dangers was to withdraw from the disorderly, in the hope that the shunning of their society might have a moral influence on them. And yet even this gentle discipline must be exercised with moderation in the remembrance that a brother was a brother still. More urgently, and as a lesson more congenial to himself, does the Apostle seek to impress upon them his own spirit, the spirit of honest industry, the spirit of peace and order, which is at once his benediction and admonition to them.

GENUINENESS OF THE SECOND EPISTLE.

THE second Epistle to the Thessalonians is not deficient in external evidence of its genuineness. As in the case of the former Epistle, the doubts that have been raised respecting it are based solely on an examination of its language and contents. They may be summed up under the following heads, the consideration of which will tend to establish the genuineness of the Epistle, as well as to throw light on its character and object:—

- i. Inconsistency with the First Epistle, in deferring the coming of Christ.
- ii. Doctrine of Antichrist, which is said to be an anachronism, either as indicating a later Montanist origin, or as betraying an allusion to later historical events.
- iii. The absence of situation and circumstance, as well as of traits of individual character.
- iv. The token at the end of the Epistle, which is the sign in all the Epistles.
- v. Likeness to, and difference from the style of St. Paul.

i. Inconsistency with the First Epistle in deferring the coming of Christ, 1 Thess. v. 2., “Yourselves know perfectly that the day of the Lord cometh as a thief in the night;” 2 Thess. ii. 3., “That day shall not come except there come a falling away first.” It may be replied, that no argument against the genuineness of the writings of St. Paul is more unsafe than that from supposed inconsistency. No writer is more apt to present us with opposite views of the same subject, even in the same Epistle, or to modify one side of a precept or of an argument by the other. (Compare the treatment of the

question of meats offered to idols in 1 Corinth. viii. ; or of the incestuous person in 1 Cor. v. ; 2 Cor. vii. ; or of the rejection of the Jews in the Epistle to the Romans.) The subject of the coming of Christ is one in which such a difference is most likely to appear, because it is one which is necessarily indistinct to us, as our ideas of time hardly apply to it. And the difference between the two passages is just similar to that which occurs elsewhere, even in different verses of the same passage of Scripture and in the discourses of our Lord himself. See Note on 1 Thess. v., and Essay on the Man of Sin.

ii. Doctrine of Antichrist: (1.) Supposed to indicate a later Montanist origin. To this it may be answered, that the doctrine of Antichrist is not Montanist, but Jewish, and in its general outline is found in the writings of Philo and the Rabbis, no less than in those of Paul and John. Even were there no express proof of its existence, it might have been safely conjectured to have followed the belief in Messiah's kingdom as the shadow does the light. Or, (2.) to betray allusions to later historical events; that is to say, Nero, who is to come again, is Antichrist; and the space between the death of Nero and the destruction of Jerusalem is the exact interval into which the composition of the Epistle fits.

The fuller answer to both objections will be found in the Essays on the Coming of Christ and on the Man of Sin. Here it will be sufficient to remark that the prophecies of the New Testament do not relate to particular events, but to the state of the world in general. They are not political, but spiritual. They take a distant view of history, and read it by a light of good and evil which they themselves cast upon it. It would be contrary to general analogy to assign any minute historical meaning to a particular passage.

iii. The absence of situation and circumstance, and of traits of individual character.

One Epistle has not as many historical allusions as another, or there is a difference of length in different Epistles. But the short-

ness of an Epistle, or the absence of historical allusions, does not prove it to be spurious; but only lessens or does away with a single proof of genuineness. In this case it may be argued further, that the connexion of the First and Second Epistles is itself an historical groundwork, and that the inconsistency between the two is only such as, from what we know of St. Paul in his other Epistles, it was natural for him, and very unnatural for a forger, to fall into. Such slight arguments may be fairly set against slight objections. And, lastly, considering the deep feeling which throughout marks the Epistle, it cannot be said to be devoid of character.

iv. The token at the end of the Epistle, which is the sign in all the Epistles.

It is argued that at this date there were no forgeries, and therefore no reason for guarding against forgery, and that the Apostle had as yet written but one Epistle.

This is the strongest objection urged by Baur against the genuineness of the Epistle. In answer it may be remarked: (1.) That the autograph salutation occurs in 1 Cor. xvi. 21. and Col. iv. 18.; that it would require minute observation to have remarked this, and yet the Epistle to which it is supposed to be transferred, exhibits no imitation either in words or train of thought of those Epistles. (2.) That it is most probable that the words of Gal. vi. 11., "Ye see in how large letters I have written to you with my own hands," are similarly a sign of the genuineness of that Epistle. It is true that to appeal to the allusion in 2 Thess. ii. 2. itself, as a proof of the existence of forged epistles in St. Paul's time, would be a circle. (3.) But the consistency of that allusion with the salutation, as well as the slightness of it, is a presumption of the Epistle having arisen from a real occasion. (4.) The readiness to practise forgery and pious fraud in an age when such forgeries were apt to be thought innocent and laudable, can hardly be estimated. Compare Rev. xxii. 18—19. Lastly, the incidental character of the Epistles we have, leads us naturally to suppose that there were others also, which have not come

down to us, and gives a rational meaning to the words in every Epistle, even though occurring in one of the first of those extant.

v. Likeness to, and difference from, the style and writings of St. Paul.

The likeness is supposed to be such as betrays an imitator ; the difference, such as renders it impossible that the epistle could have been written by St. Paul. But, on the other hand, it may be retorted that the difference is no greater than might naturally be expected in the same author writing at different times ; and the likeness of a kind such as indicates the hand, not of an imitator, but of St. Paul himself.

(1.) The examples of difference of style and language are very uncertain. The following expressions are quoted in confirmation of the objection* :—

1. *εὐχαριστεῖν ὀφείλομεν*, i. 3., ii. 13., especially in the first passage, where it is weakened by *καθὼς ἄξιόν ἐστιν*.
2. *ὑπεραυξάνει ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν*, i. 3., is said to be inconsistent with *καταρτίσαι τὰ ὑστερήματα τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν* in 1 Thess. iii. 10.
3. *αἰρεῖσθαι*, used of election in ii. 13.
4. *καὶ διὰ τοῦτο*, for *διὰ τοῦτο*, ii. 11.
5. Forced construction of *ἐπιστεῦθι τὸ μαρτύριον ἡμῶν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς*, i. 10.
6. *πᾶσα εὐδοκία ἀγαθωσύνης, ἔργον πίστεως*, i. 11. ; *ἐπιφάνεια, τῆς παρουσίας*, ii. 8. ; *δέχεσθαι τὴν ἀγάπην τῆς ἀληθείας*, ii. 10. ; *ἀξιώση τῆς κλήσεως*, i. 11. ; *καλοποιεῖν*, iii. 13.

Objections of this kind are, for the most part, matters of taste or feeling, about which it is useless to dispute. It may be observed on No. 1., that although *εὐχαριστεῖν ὀφείλομεν*, i. 3., ii. 13., does not occur elsewhere in the writings of St. Paul, it cannot be regarded as unlike his style. The form of duty is one which all thoughts naturally take in his mind. He is under obligation, compulsion, &c. to

* Baur, Paulus, pp. 489. 490.

do many things. Nor can any pleonasm or dilution of language be regarded as an evidence of the spuriousness of a writing of St. Paul's age if it be not rather, as far as it goes, a proof of its genuineness. This latter remark strictly applies to No. 2. which reminds us of the amplification of language which occurs at the commencement of his other Epistles. Neither is the supposed inconsistency in this last-mentioned passage with 1 Thess. iii. 10. so great as the difference in tone of 1 Cor. i. 5—9. and the rest of the Epistle, the wavering and variation of which are themselves characteristic of the Apostle.

On No. 3. it may be observed, that although the word *αἰρεῖσθαι* nowhere occurs in the New Testament, in the sense of election, it has this sense in Deut. xxvi. 18., whence it is not unreasonable to suppose that St. Paul, or any other writer of the New Testament, may have transferred it to his own use.—No. 4. There is no more objection to *καὶ* before *διὰ τοῦτο* than to any other pleonastic use of *καὶ*, such, for example, as that in Col. ii. 13.—No. 5. Compare Rom. iv. 9. for a similar use of *ἐπί*.—No. 6. Compare Eph. i. 5. for a pleonastic use of *ἐνδοκία*: Eph. i. 3. 8. for a similar use of *πᾶς*. Instances do not occur precisely parallel with the remaining examples; still, neither the want of clearness of expression in some of these, nor the pleonastic character of others, are at all inconsistent with the style of the Apostle.

(2.) Against such supposed dissimilarities, it is fair to set also the resemblances in manner and phraseology to the Apostle's writings. The following are characteristically, if not exclusively, St. Paul's:—

The pleonastic and vehement mode of speaking of the faith and love of his converts, in i. 3., as elsewhere, at the commencement of his Epistles, yet, as in the Corinthians, passing into reproof of some at the close of the Epistle.

The antithetical turn of thought in ver. 6. 7., and real, though latent, parallelism with Phil. i. 28. 29.

The mode of connecting *ἐνδοξασθῆναι* with the word *ἐν δόξῃ* in i. 10.; the echo of *ἐνδοξασθῆναι* in *ἐνδοξασθῆ*, ver. 12.; the

verbal connexion of *ἐπιστεύθη* with *πιστεύασιν* in ver. 10.; the reciprocal expression *ἐν ὑμῖν καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐν αὐτῷ* in ver. 12.

The use of the word *καυχᾶσθαι* (*ἐγκανχᾶσθαι*), which in its peculiar sense is almost confined to St. Paul, and which, inclusively of its derivatives, occurs more than fifty times in his writings.

The *ἵνα* in i. 11., and the more remote *ὅπως* in ver. 12., like Rom. vii. 13.

The anacoluthon in ii. 3.

The expression in ii. 3., *μή τις ὑμᾶς ἐξαπατήσῃ*, like the warning in Eph. v. 6., *μηδεὶς ὑμᾶς ἀπατάτω κενοῖς λόγοις*.

The recurrence to his visit to them, as in Cor., Gal., Phil., 1 Thess.

The following parallelisms: 2 Thess. ii. 7., *μόνον ὁ κατέχων*, participle without verb; so Rom. xii. 16. 17. 19. 2 Thess. ii. 10., *ἐν τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις*; so 1 Cor. i. 18., 2 Cor. ii. 15. 2 Thess. ii. 12., *ἐνδοκῆσαντες [ἐν] τῇ ἀδικίᾳ*; Rom. i. 32., *συνενδοκοῦσι τοῖς πράσσοσιν*.

The defective antithesis in ii. 12.

The expressions 2 Thess. ii. 13., *εὐχαριστεῖν πάντοτε*; compare 1 Cor. i. 4., *εὐχαριστῶ τῷ Θεῷ μου πάντοτε*. 2 Thess. ii. 15., *ἄρα οὖν, ἀδελφοί*; so Rom. viii. 12., *ἄρα οὖν, ἀδελφοί*; Gal. iv. 31., *ἄρα, ἀδελφοί*. 2 Thess. ii. 16., *παράκλησιν . . . καὶ ἐλπίδα*; Rom. xv. 4., *τῆς παρακλήσεως τῶν γραφῶν τὴν ἐλπίδα ἔχωμεν*. 2 Thess. iii. 2., *ἵνα ῥυσθῶμεν*; Rom. xv. 31., *ἵνα ῥυσθῶ*.

The word *ἀπαρχή*, used, as elsewhere, and only in St. Paul, of the earliest converts, and here to be compared with *ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου*, Phil. iv. 15.

The juxtaposition of *παρακαλεῖν* and *στηρίζειν* in ii. 17. as in Rom. i. 11. 12.

The echo of sound, rather than of sense in *πίστις* and *πιστός*, in iii. 3., and of *πιστός* in *πεποίθαμεν* in ver. 3. 4.; compare Rom. xxi. 13. 14.

The expression in 2 Thess. iii. 6., *παραγγέλλομεν . . . ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου*; so 1 Cor. vii. 10., *παραγγέλλω οὐκ ἐγὼ ἀλλ' ὁ κύριος*.

The words *οὐχ ὅτι οὐκ ἔχομεν ἐξουσίαν*, iii. 9., which occur also in 1 Cor. ix. 4., there as a part of the main argument, but here incidentally ; also the passage which follows, and the use of the word *ἐπιβαρῆσαι* just before, in the same sense as *ἁβάρῃς* 2 Cor. xi. 9.

The sudden alternation from the language of severity to that of love, in iii. 14. 15. ; compare 1 Cor. v. and 2 Cor. ii. 6. 2 Thess. iii. 13., *μὴ ἐκκακήσητε καλοποιούντες*. So Gal. vi. 9., *τὸ δὲ καλὸν ποιοῦντες μὴ ἐκκακῶμεν*. 2 Thess. iii. 16., *εἰρήνης*, towards the end of the Epistle. So Rom. xvi. 20. ; 2 Cor. xiii. 11. ; Gal. vi. 16.

The play of words (iii. 11.), *μηδὲν ἐργαζομένους, ἀλλὰ περιεργαζομένους*. Compare Rom. i. 20. 28., ii. 1., &c.

TIME AND PLACE OF THE SECOND EPISTLE.

THE Second Epistle to the Thessalonians affords of itself no indication of time or place. But when taken in connexion with the First Epistle, it must be presumed to have been written not earlier, but later, as the First Epistle immediately refers to the Apostle's first visit to Thessalonica, and this in a manner inconsistent with the supposition that a previous Epistle had intervened. The First Epistle was written sometime during the Apostle's eighteen months' stay in Corinth and its neighbourhood. How long afterwards the Second Epistle followed, we can only judge from so precarious an argument as the degree of connexion between them. Are the circumstances and state of feeling described in the Second Epistle sufficiently different from those in the First to require a considerable interval? or so similar as to imply a short one only?

It is at least doubtful whether the Apostle in ii. 2. is referring to his former Epistle. (See note.) Leaving the discussion of this verse, therefore, as having nothing to do with our present subject, the points of connexion which the two Epistles present are the following:—

- (1.) The persecutions which are still continuing.
- (2.) The expectation of the coming of Christ; which, in the Second Epistle, has taken a new turn; the former anxiety about the departed having passed away, and a general unsettlement of mind having taken its place, arising out of a belief of the nearness of the great event.
- (3.) The disorder of the Church, and interruption of daily occupations.

From such data we cannot form any certain conclusions. The second of the above-mentioned points of connexion implies some, the first and third not a very long interval. The circumstances of the Church seem to be the same in both Epistles, but the state of feeling to be rapidly changing. The First Epistle presents us with the picture of an early Christian Church, within a few months, at latest, from its conversion. The Second presents us, though in uncertain outline, with the picture of the same Church a few months later, with some of its features aggravated, others softened, so far as we can indistinctly trace them in the exhortations of the Apostle. The same persons who first preached the Gospel at Thessalonica, Paul and Silvanus and Timotheus, are still together, as they are joined in the superscription of the Epistle.

These considerations, together with the improbability of supposing the Epistle to be contemporaneous with any of the later writings of St. Paul, lead to the inference that it was sent from Corinth or its neighbourhood, during the latter part of the Apostle's eighteen months' stay there.

ΠΡΟΣ ΘΕΣΣΑΛΟΝΙΚΕΙΣ
Β.

ΠΡΟΣ ΘΕΣΣΑΛΟΝΙΚΕΙΣ Β.

ΠΑΥΛΟΣ καὶ Σιλουανὸς καὶ Τιμόθεος τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ Θεσσα- 1
λονικέων ἐν θεῷ πατρὶ ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ χριστῷ.
χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς [ἡμῶν] καὶ κυρίου 2
Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ.

Εὐχαριστεῖν ὀφείλομεν τῷ θεῷ πάντοτε περὶ ὑμῶν, 3
ἀδελφοί, καθὼς ἄξιόν ἐστιν, ὅτι ὑπεραυξάνει ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν
καὶ πλεονάζει ἡ ἀγάπη ἐνὸς ἐκάστου πάντων ὑμῶν εἰς
ἀλλήλους, ὥστε ἡμᾶς αὐτοὺς ἐν ὑμῖν ἐγκαυχᾶσθαι¹ ἐν ταῖς 4
ἐκκλησίαις τοῦ θεοῦ ὑπὲρ τῆς ὑπομονῆς ὑμῶν καὶ πίστεως

¹ καυχᾶσθαι.

I. The substance of the first chapter may be summed up as follows:—The Apostle commends his converts, for their faith amid persecutions. This commendation he utters in the form of a thanksgiving, in which, as elsewhere, the power of expression seems to fall short of the fulness of his thought. He regards the persecution that they are enduring as a proof of the righteous judgment of God. For it must be considered as part of a whole, the present balancing with the future, their state here alternating with that of their enemies in the world to come. "Son, thou in thy life hadst thy good things and likewise Lazarus evil things, but now he is comforted, and thou art tormented." This the Apostle regards as the law of compensation, in God's dealings with the heathen and the despisers of the Gospel, in the day when they shall pass away for ever from his

presence, and his saints who have believed the word of the Apostle, shall magnify him. For which end the Apostle prays without ceasing, that God may make them worthy of their calling and the name of Christ be glorified in them.

1. 2. Compare notes on the salutation of the First Epistle, which is the same, with the exception of the words, ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, here no longer doubtful.

3. Εὐχαριστεῖν ὀφείλομεν, *we are bound to thank.*] The plural may be intended to include Silvanus and Timotheus, or we may consider St. Paul as already making the transition and using the plural of himself only, as elsewhere.

καθὼς ἄξιον, *as it is meet.*] The apparent tautology of these words ("we ought to do it as we ought") it is proposed to obviate by connecting them closely with the

II. THESSALONIANS.

- 1 PAUL, and Silvanus, and Timotheus, unto the Church of the Thessalonians in God our Father and the Lord
- 2 Jesus Christ: Grace unto you, and peace, from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.
- 3 WE are bound to thank God always for you, brethren, as it is meet, because that your faith groweth exceedingly, and the love* of every one of you all toward
- 4 each other aboundeth; so that we ourselves glory in you in the churches of God for your patience and faith

clause which follows:—“We ought to give thanks always for you, as is fitting, because of the exceeding abundance of your faith.” To this it may be objected, in turn, that the proposed connexion of the clauses is unnatural and the meaning poor. Many pleonastic expressions of St. Paul border on tautology; but tautology with him is often emphasis. In this case the words *καθὼς ἄξιόν ἐστιν* may be regarded as an emphatic repetition of the preceding, “we ought to give thanks, as is worthy;” *ἄξιόν* expressing a higher degree of the same notion than *ὀφείλομεν*—it is not merely an obligation, but a noble and worthy thing, a free-will offering as well as a duty: “it is very meet, right, and our bounden duty.”

ἐνὸς ἑκάστου, of each individual of all of you,] *εἰς ἀλλήλους,* to be taken with *ἡ ἀγάπη.* ὥστε ἡμᾶς αὐτοῖς: not intended to

indicate that in general a man should not glory, but merely that the excess of their faith and grace was such that it reflected itself even on others, and made Paul also himself glory on their behalf in other Churches. The emphasis on *ἡμᾶς αὐτοῖς* intimates that, however natural it may be for a person to boast of himself, it is unnatural for others to boast of him; so that it is not only you who boast of yourselves, but we ourselves who boast of you. Yet, in a writer like St. Paul, we cannot certainly say that this apparent point is more than a false emphasis or awkwardness of expression.

4. *ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τοῦ Θεοῦ.*] *i.e.* in Corinth and the neighbouring towns. *ὑπομονῆς,* in allusion to persecutions; *διωγμοῖς* and *θλίψεις* may be distinguished, as particular and general, as persecutions and trials. *αἷς ἀνέχεσθε,* “wherewith or wherein ye en-

ἐν πάσιν τοῖς διωγμοῖς ὑμῶν καὶ ταῖς θλίψεσιν αἷς ἀνέ-
 χεσθε, ἔνδειγμα τῆς δικαίας κρίσεως τοῦ θεοῦ, εἰς τὸ κατα- 5
 ξιωθῆναι ὑμᾶς τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ ὑπὲρ ἧς καὶ πάσχετε,
 εἰ περ δίκαιον παρὰ θεῷ ἀνταποδοῦναι τοῖς θλίβουσιν ὑμᾶς 6
 θλίψιν καὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς θλιβομένοις ἄνεσιν μεθ' ἡμῶν ἐν τῇ 7
 ἀποκαλύψει τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ μετ' ἀγγέλων
 δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ ἐν φλογὶ πυρὸς¹ διδόντος ἐκδίκησιν τοῖς μὴ 8
 εἰδόσι θεὸν καὶ τοῖς μὴ ὑπακούουσιν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ τοῦ
 κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ [χριστοῦ], οἵτινες δίκην τίσουσιν 9
 ὁλέθριον² αἰώνιον ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ κυρίου καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς
 δόξης τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ, ὅταν ἔλθῃ ἐνδοξασθῆναι ἐν τοῖς 10

¹ ἐν πυρὶ φλογός.² ὁλεθρον.

sure;" or for ὤν, by attraction, "which ye endure."

5. 6. The Apostle transfers himself to a new point of view. Their present persecution was a proof of God's justice, for it was a token that God would give them a place in His kingdom, if on the other hand, the punishment of their enemies hereafter was in accordance with the just judgment of God; for the relative position of both would be altered in the world to come, the order of another life being itself an inversion of the order of this. Good and evil, now and hereafter are diametrically opposed. Thus we have two arguments:—

They suffer now: therefore,
 Their enemies will suffer hereafter.

Their enemies will suffer hereafter: therefore,

They will be comforted hereafter.

But are such arguments really valid? it will be asked. They are arguments of the same kind as those in the eleventh chapter

of Romans:—"If the root is holy, how much more the branches? if the rejection of the Jews is the salvation of the world, how much more their restoration?" In other words, the substance or thing meant, is real, but the form is dialectical or rhetorical. A near parallel to the present passage is furnished by Phil. i. 28:—"And in nothing terrified by your adversaries: which is to them an evident token of perdition, but to you of salvation, and that of God;" words which at the same time express the feelings with which the heathen must have often looked upon the sufferings of the first Christians.

ἔνδειγμα is put in apposition with the idea of affliction or endurance in the previous verse. In their sufferings, the Apostle sees by implication the sufferings of their enemies; and these reflect, as in a glass, their own happiness. Viewed in this light, their very suffering is but an anticipation of the justice of God.

εἰς τὸ καταξιωθῆναι ὑμᾶς.] εἰς=

- in all your persecutions and tribulations that ye endure:
 5 which is a manifest token of the righteous judgment of
 God, that ye may be counted worthy of the kingdom of
 6 God, for which ye also suffer: seeing it is a righteous
 thing with God to recompense tribulation to them that
 7 trouble you; and to you who are troubled rest with us,
 when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven
 8 with his mighty angels, in flaming fire taking ven-
 geance on them that know not God, and that obey not
 9 the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ: who shall be
 punished with everlasting destruction from the presence
 10 of the Lord, and from the glory of his power; when he

the result, as in 2 Cor. viii. 6., or the object. It is the result or end of their persecution, that they may be counted worthy of the kingdom.

ὑπὲρ ἧς καὶ πάσχετε] suggests the reason and pledge of their election to the kingdom of God.

εἰ περ δίκαιον] is taken up from δικαίας κρίσεως, since it is just of God to punish your enemies.

7. ἄνεσιν, *rest, relaxation from trouble*] describes the kingdom of heaven negatively, "where the wicked cease from troubling, where the weary are at rest."

μετ' ἀγγέλων δυνάμειος αὐτοῦ, with angels that show his power.

8. ἐν φλογὶ πυρός, *in flaming fire*,] is an image taken from the Old Testament, Exod. iii. 2., Dan. vii. 9. 10., expressing at once the manner of Christ's appearing, and the instrument by which he executes vengeance on his enemies. So in 1 Cor. iii. 13., the "revelation is by fire."

τοῖς μὴ εἰδόνιν θεὸν καὶ τοῖς μὴ

ὑπακούουσιν.] Under the two classes here described, are obscurely indicated the Gentiles, who know not God, and the Jews, who are a disobedient race.

9. οὔτινες] quippe qui, nimirum qui, as in Rom. vi. 2.

ἀπὸ προσώπου.] Not after the appearance, or by the appearance, either of which explanations is forced; but away from, separate from the face of the Lord and the glory of His power.

τῆς δόξης τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ.] Not the glory which is the creation of his power, but his mighty glory, the glory which overpowers men at his appearing, as of the sun travelling in the greatness of his strength (compare τὸ κράτος τῆς δόξης, Col. i. 11. and ver. 7. μετ' ἀγγέλων δυνάμειος αὐτοῦ). This is confirmed by the next verse, the thought of which is caught up from the word δόξα in the preceding.

10. ὅταν ἔλθῃ, *when he shall come*] (sc. ὥστε) to be glorified, ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις refers, not to angels,

ἀγίοις αὐτοῦ καὶ θαυμασθῆναι ἐν πάσιν τοῖς πιστεύουσιν¹,
 ὅτι ἐπιστεύθη τὸ μαρτύριον ἡμῶν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ
 ἐκείνῃ. εἰς ὃ καὶ προσευχόμεθα πάντοτε περὶ ὑμῶν, ἵνα 11
 ὑμᾶς ἀξιώσῃ τῆς κλήσεως ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν καὶ πληρώσῃ
 πᾶσαν εὐδοκίαν ἀγαθωσύνης καὶ ἔργον πίστεως ἐν δυ-
 νάμει, ὅπως ἐνδοξασθῇ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ 12
 [χριστοῦ] ἐν ὑμῖν καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐν αὐτῷ κατὰ τὴν χάριν τοῦ
 θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ.

Ἐρωτῶμεν δὲ ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, ὑπὲρ τῆς παρουσίας τοῦ 2
 κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ καὶ ἡμῶν ἐπισυναγωγῆς ἐπ'

[¹ πιστεύουσιν.

but to the souls of believers. The array in which the Lord comes, will consist both of an innumerable company of angels, and the spirits of just men made perfect. ἐν = neither "by" nor "in the midst of;" but is expressive of the close union of Christ with those who are the manifestation of his glory. As the Father is said to be glorified in the Son, John, xiv. 3., so is the Son said to be glorified in his saints. Compare ἐγκαυχᾶσθαι ἐν ὑμῖν, ver. 4.

ὅτι ἐπιστεύθη τὸ μαρτύριον ἡμῶν.] The most natural explanation of these words is to regard them as a mere epexegetis of πιστεύουσιν. "To be marvelled at by all believers, because you believed us;" the clause ὅτι ἐπιστεύθη being intended to connect the general clause ἐν τοῖς πιστεύουσιν with the Church at Thessalonica, to which the Apostle had preached. "When he comes to be glorified in his saints, and wondered at, among all believers, because of the success of the Gospel, whereof I am a minister." ἐφ' ὑμᾶς is to be joined with μαρτύριον. ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ is connected with

ἐνδοξασθῆναι: but compare note on Rom. ii. 12.

11. εἰς ὃ.] "In reference to which;" or better, to the "attainment of which end;" the thought being further carried on in the words that follow ἵνα ὑμᾶς ἀξιώσῃ καὶ.] Which shall be, and to which end we pray also.

τῆς κλήσεως.] The calling of man by God may be regarded as the first act, and beginning of a Christian life. But the acts of God may be viewed also as unchangeable, and therefore as the end rather than the beginning of the work. In the beginning the end is implied. In this latter sense, the word κλήσις is here used. Comp. note on 1 Thess. iii. 7.

πληρῶσῃ πᾶσαν εὐδοκίαν ἀγαθωσύνης, fulfil all the good pleasure of his goodness.] It has been doubted in reference to the last two words, whether they allude to the Thessalonians, or to God the Giver; or εὐδοκία to the first, ἀγαθωσύνη to the second: (1.) all gladness in well doing; or, (2.) all his goodness wherein he delights; or, (3.) all his good pleasure in their righteousness. Ra-

- shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe because our testimony
- 11 *to you was believed in that day. Wherefore also we pray always for you, that our God would count you worthy of this calling, and fulfil all the good pleasure of his goodness, and the work of faith with power:
- 12 that the name of our Lord Jesus Christ may be glorified in you, and ye in him, according to the grace of our God and the Lord Jesus Christ.
- 2 NOW we beseech you, brethren, on *behalf of the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and our gathering together

ther, as with the word *δικαιοσύνη* the Apostle uses mixed modes of thought, and has not distinguished between the word of God as the cause and as the effect. The believer is separated by so thin a film from the Spirit of God that the operation of the one is often in Scripture transferred to the other, and language wavers in its meaning between the two, or seems to comprehend both.

12. *ὅπως ἐνδοξάσθῃ, that may be glorified.*] That is, that the Lord may be glorified in you, and ye in him. The words *τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου* have no specific meaning, and yet are not precisely equivalent to *ὁ κύριος*. There is an appropriateness in the use of the language of the Old Testament, to express the glory of "His appearing."

II. "I beseech you, brethren, as an advocate for the truth respecting the coming of Christ, that ye be not soon shaken by any impulse from within, or word, or letter of any, as though it were what I taught you, that the day of the Lord is at hand. For ye remember what I said, while I was with

you, that Antichrist must first come. And now you know what hindrance it is that delays his being revealed, and reserves him for his own time. For already he is working unseen, and shall appear when the hinderer is taken away. Then shall be the manifestation of Satan on earth, the image of the true, with all manner of falsehood and imposture, and power of delusion to those who will be deceived, in the deception of whom God himself shall assist, that they may be all brought into judgment. Him," the Apostle adds by anticipation in the eighth verse, "the Lord shall destroy with the breath of his mouth and the manifestation of his presence."

"But in contrast with these terrors of the Lord, we, brethren beloved, have need to give thanks to God, that he chose you as the first fruits of the Gospel, to the inheritance of the kingdom of Christ. What stronger motive can there be to stand firm and hold fast what has been delivered to you? And may our Lord Jesus Christ, and God our Father who loved us

αὐτόν, εἰς τὸ μὴ ταχέως σαλευθῆναι ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ νοὸς 2
 μηδὲ¹ θροεῖσθαι, μήτε διὰ πνεύματος μήτε διὰ λόγου μήτε
 δι' ἐπιστολῆς, ὡς δι' ἡμῶν, ὡς ὅτι ἐνέστηκεν ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ
 κυρίου.² μὴ τις ὑμᾶς ἐξαπατήσῃ κατὰ μηδένα τρόπον, ὅτι 3
 ἐὰν μὴ ἔλθῃ ἡ ἀποστασία πρῶτον καὶ ἀποκαλυφθῇ ὁ

¹ μήτε.

² τοῦ χριστοῦ.

and gave us consolation far beyond our temporal sufferings, comfort and strengthen you!"

1—10. is suggested by the mention of the judgment in the previous chapter, and has reference to opinions actually existing in the Thessalonian Church. They had suffered persecution and this led the Apostle to the thought, that the judgment of God would be upon their enemies, in the day of the Lord. But a sort of counter-thought arises in his mind, 'that this coming of the day of the Lord was the very subject upon which he had to warn them to be calm, and not think day after day, that the course of the world was to be interrupted. "God is about to take vengeance on your enemies and that speedily" would be the natural sequence. But the Apostle turns aside to teach them, that in fact "it would not be speedily," for a vision of evil must come first. And he proceeds to recall to their minds, the lesson which he had taught while yet with them, respecting the man of sin and that which let.

1. ὑπέρ.] Not as in the English version "by," as though a formula of adjuration. There would be no point in saying—"I beseech you by the day of the Lord, not to suppose that the day of the Lord is at hand. ὑπέρ, in this passage, may be taken, either as equivalent to περί, or better in

the sense of "on behalf of," as though he were pleading in honour of that day, that the expectation of it might not be a source of disorder in the Church.

ἡμῶν ἐπισυναγωγῆς.] Compare 1 Thess. iv. 17.;—"Then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds."

2. σαλευθῆναι ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ νοῦς, *that ye be not soon shaken from your mind,*] or so as to lose your mind. Comp. Rom. ix. 3., ἀνάθεμα εἶναι . . . ἀπὸ τοῦ χριστοῦ.

μήτε διὰ πνεύματος, *by spirit.*] Do not let any spiritual influence take possession of you, and unsettle your mind. πνεῦμα, not in that sense of the word, in which all Christians are partakers of it, but rather with reference to the irregular manifestations of the spirit, as of "a rushing mighty wind," carrying men whither they would not.

μήτε διὰ λόγου, *by word,*] may be connected, either with what precedes, or with what follows; either, be not moved by any spiritual manifestation, nor by word spoken of argument or exhortation; or, be not moved either by word pretending to come from us, or by letter pretending to come from us. According to the first explanation, πνεύματος is opposed to λόγου, as the supernatural ecstatic impulse to ordinary instruction.

μήτε δι' ἐπιστολῆς, *by letter.*] Do

2 unto him, that ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be
troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter
3 as from us, as that the day of the Lord¹ is at hand.
Let no man deceive you by any means: for except
there come the falling away* first, and the man of sin

¹ Of Christ.

these words relate to a misconception of the former Epistle, or to a forgery? In favour of the first supposition may be urged: (1.) the coincidence of the subject; (2.) the improbability of any one forging an Epistle from St. Paul, at a time when he was himself living and writing to the Church of Thessalonica; (3.) the allusion in ii. 15., whether to the Epistle in which it occurs, or the previous one, is uncertain; (4.) the additional improbability of his passing over such an offence, with so slight an allusion. On the other hand, the Apostle does not complain of a misunderstanding or misrepresentation of his words, but appears to disown the Epistle itself: and the former Epistle could not easily have given rise to such a misconception as is here implied. The most probable hypothesis is that the Apostle is not referring definitely to any particular speech or Epistle, but to the possibility only of some one or other being used against him. Many may have passed between them, and what inferences might be drawn was uncertain. We might translate the whole passage thus:—"Be not quickly moved either by spirit or words or letter, as though these expressed our sentiments." πνεύματος is half connected with, and half forgotten in the words δι' ἡμῶν. ὥς ὅτι may be regarded as a confusion of two constructions.

3. κατὰ μηδένα τρόπον, by this or any other means.

ὅτι ἐὰν μὴ ἔλθῃ, *except there come,*] is an anacoluthon. "Let no man deceive you, because except there come a falling away first,"—ἐξαναήσῃ may be taken in a pregnant sense, in which case ὅτι will mark the subject of the deception. "Let no man deceive you, saying that that day will come, except there come the falling away first." But, owing to the length of the sentence, the latter end of it forgets the beginning.

ἡ ἀποστασία, *the falling away,*] either that of which he had spoken to them while he was yet with them, or the falling away which in his own mind was inseparable from the coming of Christ, which was to follow. Of what nature was this falling away? What vision of apostasy rose before him as he wrote this? Was it within or without? permanent or passing? persecution by the heathen, or the disorganisation of the body of Christ itself? Was it the transition of the Church from its first love to a more secular and earthly state, or the letting loose of a spiritual world of evil, such as the Apostle describes in Eph. vi. 12.? So ideal a picture cannot properly be limited to any person or institution. That it is an inward, not an outward evil, that is depicted, is implied in the very

ἄνθρωπος τῆς ἁμαρτίας, ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας, ὁ ἀντικείμενος 4
καὶ ὑπεραιρόμενος ἐπὶ πάντα λεγόμενον θεὸν ἢ σέβασμα,
ὥστε αὐτὸν εἰς τὸν ναὸν τοῦ θεοῦ¹ καθίσαι ἀποδεικνύντα
ἑαυτὸν ὅτι ἔστιν θεός. οὐ μνημονεύετε ὅτι ἔτι ὦν πρὸς ὑμᾶς 5
ταῦτα ἔλεγον ὑμῖν ; καὶ νῦν τὸ κατέχον οἴδατε, εἰς τὸ ἀποκα- 6
λυφθῆναι αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ ἑαυτοῦ καιρῷ. τὸ γὰρ μυστήριον ἤδη 7

¹ Add *ὡς θεόν*.

name apostasy. It is not the evil of the heathen world, sunk in grossness and unconsciousness, but evil rebelling against good, conflicting with good in the spiritual world itself. And the conflict is of the same nature, though in a wider sphere, as the strife of good and evil in the heart of the individual. It is that same strife, not as represented in the seventh of Romans, but at a later stage, when evil is fast becoming good, and the remembrance of the past itself is carrying men away from the truth.

καὶ ἀποκαλυφθῇ.] Antichrist, like Christ, is to be revealed: the veil is lifted up, and he is seen as he is.

ὁ ἄνθρωπος τῆς ἁμαρτίας.] The impersonation of sin. Compare Rom. vi. 6., ὁ πάλαιος ἄνθρωπος.

ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας.] Not who brings others to perdition, but who is perdition himself and the son of perdition, the very image of self-destroying evil. Compare for the expression, though there applied to an individual, John, xvii. 12.; also αἰρέσεις ἀπωλείας, in 2 Peter, ii. 1., and Ἀπολλύων, in Rev. ix. 11. There is no reason to suppose that either of these descriptions refers to an individual, any more than the prince of this world spoken of by our Saviour; the prince of the

power of the air, in the Epistle to the Ephesians; or the beast and false prophet, spoken of in the Book of Revelation. As Christ is a person, so evil is impersonated as his antagonist.

4. ὁ ἀντικείμενος, *the opposer*,] the same whom St. John calls Antichrist, here more indefinitely and generally expressed; not Satan himself, from whom, in ver. 9., he is distinguished, but his instrument working upon earth.

ὑπεραιρόμενος ἐπὶ πάντα λεγόμενον θεόν, *who exalteth, &c.*] The image is taken from Dan. xi. 36. Compare also Dan. vii. 25.:—"There are gods many and lords many," and over all in his insolence does he place himself. λεγόμενον seems to be added as an euphemism, to avoid setting the heathen gods in the same rank with Jehovah.

σέβασμα, *object of reverence*,] used in Acts, xvii. 23., for idols. καθίσαι is here, as commonly in the New Testament, used intransitively. ἑαυτόν, showing that he is himself God.

εἰς τὸν ναὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, *in the temple of God*.] Either: (1.) the temple at Jerusalem; or, (2.) the Christian Church; or, (3.) more truly both, the one being the image of the other, as in our Lord's words,—"Destroy this temple." The use of the image may have been suggested by the

4 be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself over* all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he¹ sitteth in the
5 temple of God, shewing himself that he is God,—Remember ye not, that, when I was yet with you, I told
6 you these things? And now ye know what withholdeth, that he *may be revealed in his time. For the

¹ Add as God.

recent attempt of Caligula to place his statue in the Temple, as well as by the common practice of deifying the Roman emperors. "In medio mihi Cæsar erit, templumque tenebit." Antichrist, ὁ ἀντικείμενος, is not without, but within the Church, usurping the place of God. The Jewish Temple being regarded as the symbol of the Christian Church, or of the world itself, that other temple of God, the man of sin, is the personified and concentrated might of evil possessing it by force. See Essay on the Man of Sin.

ἀποδεικνύντα ἑαυτὸν ὅτι ἔστιν θεός, = ἀποδεικνύντα ἑαυτὸν θεόν.] These words carry on the thought which has preceded. He sits in the temple of God, and openly declares himself to be God. It need scarcely be remarked that we are not to imagine a person suddenly coming forward and claiming divine honours. This would be, not a mystery of iniquity, but an absurdity. What the Apostle is speaking of is a form of evil springing out of the state of the world itself, to which mankind are ready to give homage.

5. Comp. 1 Thess. iii. 4. This that I am telling you may sound strange. But do ye not remem-

ber that ye have heard it before from me by word of mouth, when I was yet with you. I do but hint to you now what I then told you more fully. Or we may trace the connexion in a slightly different way. How is it that you have taken up these extravagant notions about the immediate coming of Christ? Have you forgotten what I told you about the manifestation of Antichrist and the interval which must precede? Comp. 1 John, ii. 21., where the Apostle refers in the same way to the knowledge which his converts had of the appearance of Antichrist—"I wrote not unto you, because ye know not the truth, but because ye know it."

6. καὶ νῦν, and now.] Not of time, but of transition, and connecting both with what precedes and what follows:—"And now when you call to mind what I told you, you know further what hinders Antichrist, even as Antichrist hinders the coming of Christ."

εἰς τὸ ἀποκαλυφθῆναι, that he may be revealed.] The coming of Antichrist, like that of Christ, has its appointed time. Men were looking for the day of the Lord, but it was not yet; Antichrist must first come. They

ἐνεργεῖται τῆς ἀνομίας, μόνον ὁ κατέχων ἄρτι ἕως ἐκ μέσου γένηται. καὶ τότε ἀποκαλυφθήσεται ὁ ἄνομος, ὃν ὁ κύριος 8
 Ἰησοῦς ἀνελεῖ¹ τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ καὶ καταργήσῃ τῇ ἐπιφανείᾳ τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ, οὗ ἐστὶν ἡ 9
 παρουσία κατ' ἐνέργειαν τοῦ σατανᾶ ἐν πάσῃ δυνάμει καὶ σημείοις καὶ τέρασιν ψεύδους καὶ ἐν πάσῃ ἀπάτῃ² ἀδικίας 10

¹ ἀναλώσει.² Add τῆς.

would look for Antichrist, but it was not yet.

That τὸ κατέχον refers to the hindrance of Antichrist is plain from ὁ κατέχων in the succeeding verse. As in the case of Antichrist itself, the change of gender indicates that the hindrance spoken of may be regarded indifferently as a thing or as a person.

"That which letteth" has been variously explained to mean the prayers of Christians, or the ministry of the Apostle himself, or the Roman empire, about the destruction of which the Apostle expresses himself in dark and enigmatic terms; or, more generally, the purpose of God to delay its appearance. That the Roman empire was a limit to the anarchy and licentiousness of the world is a natural view to us. But we do not find anywhere else in the writings of St. Paul any similar view, nor is it easy to see how the Roman empire could be said to curb or restrain forms of spiritual evil, although it might seem to stand between the world and the papacy, or between the world and the irruption of the barbarians. Compare Essay on the Man of Sin.

The subject admits also of being regarded in a more general way. Again and again, in Scripture occurs the idea of an order

and series of events, not to be anticipated in the providence of God. Thus our Saviour says:—"It is not for you to know the times and the seasons which the Father hath put in his own power." The Gospel itself comes "in the fulness of time." There is a fitness of times and seasons, preparations and tendencies going before, and the final event following them. As in the Old Testament, "the iniquity of the Amorites is not yet full," so in the New, God is described as waiting and interposing hindrances that the order of Providence might not be inverted. Compare the Tragic feeling:—τὸ μόρσιμον μένει πάλαι, ἐνχομένοις δ' ἂν ἔλθοι.

7. τὸ γὰρ μυστήριον ἤδη . . . τῆς ἀνομίας μυστήριον] is here opposed to ἀποκαλυφθῆναι, as ἤδη . . . τοῦ ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ καιρῷ. μυστήριον τῆς ἀνομίας does not differ from ἀποστασία, except as it expresses the hidden spiritual character of the wickedness about to come upon the earth. (Comp. for the expression 1 Tim. iii. 16. εὐσεβείας μυστήριον, as it were, in connexion with the secret counsels of God.) Comp. 1 John, iv. 3.:—"This is that spirit of Antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world."

μόνον ὁ κατέχων. We may place

- mystery of iniquity doth already work: only he who now letteth will let, until he be taken out of the way.
- 8 And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall slay,¹ with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming: whose
- 9 coming is after the working of Satan with all power
- 10 and *lying signs and wonders, and with all deceiv-

¹ Consume.

the stop after or before *μόνον*: either, (1.) for the hidden mystery of iniquity is already at work, but only (as a hidden mystery) until he that now hinders be taken out of the way; or, (2.) for the mystery of iniquity already works, *μόνον* being taken with the succeeding clause, only he who now letteth will let. (Comp. Gal. ii. 10.: *μόνον τῶν πτωχῶν ἵνα μνημονεύωμεν*.) Neither explanation is wholly free from objection. Against the first may be urged the order of the words; against the second, the awkwardness of omitting *ἔστι*.

For the general sense of the passage, comp. 1 John, ii. 17.:—"As ye have heard that Antichrist shall come, even now there are many Antichrists whereby we know that it is the last time." Hidden in the bosom of the earth and of the world, the power of evil is already stirring, a mystery still, even as the believer's life is hidden with Christ and God.

8. καὶ τότε.] And then when he that letteth is taken out of the way, that lawless one, *i. e.* the son of perdition, shall be revealed. Yet not to have a long reign on the earth. Before describing his appearance, the Apostle, as it were, by way of consolation to the Church, anticipates his destruction.

τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ] is a poetical expression taken from the Old Testament. It implies, first, the power of God, as in Psalm xxxiii. 6. where it is said, the host of the heavens were made by the breath of his mouth (*τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ*); secondly, the wrath of God, as in Isaiah, xi. 4., where nearly the same expressions occur:—"He shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked."

τῇ ἐπιφάνειᾳ τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ, with the brightness of his coming.] The word *ἐπιφάνεια* may either express the reality and vividness of his coming, or may be considered as meaning the "mere apparition of his presence;" as Bengelsays—*Apparitio adventus ipso adventu prior est vel certè prima ipsius adventus emicatio uti, ἐπιφάνεια τῆς ἡμέρας.*

9—10. The Apostle having anticipated the overthrow of anti-Christ, returns to the description of him, whose presence will be, yea, and now is, according to the working of Satan, with all false power and all false signs and wonders (*πάσῃ καὶ ψεύδους* both refer to all the substantives), and in all unrighteous deceit to the lost, because they did not receive the truth for their salvation. In

τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις, ἀνθ' ὧν τὴν ἀγάπην τῆς ἀληθείας οὐκ
 ἐδέξαντο εἰς τὸ σωθῆναι αὐτούς. καὶ διὰ τοῦτο πέμπει¹ 11
 αὐτοῖς ὁ θεὸς ἐνέργειαν πλάνης, εἰς τὸ πιστεῦσαι αὐτοὺς
 τῷ ψεύδει, ἵνα κριθῶσιν πάντες οἱ μὴ πιστεύσαντες τῇ 12
 ἀληθείᾳ ἀλλ' εὐδοκήσαντες [ἐν] τῇ ἀδικίᾳ.

Ἡμεῖς δὲ ὀφείλομεν εὐχαριστεῖν τῷ θεῷ πάντοτε περὶ 13
 ὑμῶν, ἀδελφοὶ ἡγαπημένοι ὑπὸ κυρίου, ὅτι εἴλατο ὑμᾶς ὁ
 θεὸς ἀπαρχῇ² εἰς σωτηρίαν ἐν ἀγιασμῷ πνεύματος καὶ
 πίστει ἀληθείας, εἰς ὃ ἐκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς, διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου 14
 ἡμῶν, εἰς περιποίησιν δόξης τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ

¹ πέμπει.² ἀπ' ἀρχῆς.

the words ἀδικ. τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις the dative implies that the falsehood has a natural and congenial effect on them. It is a falsehood specially apt to deceive them. Yet the cause of this is in themselves, because they have not received the truth in love—they have not learnt to love the truth. The expression, not receiving the love of the truth, does not imply any higher degree of alienation from the truth than the simpler expression, “not receiving the truth.” It is a periphrasis agreeable to the Apostle’s mode of speech, but not equally so to our own idiom.

11. διὰ τοῦτο.] “He that hath to him shall be given, and he that hath not shall lose even that which he hath.” According to the view of the Apostle, God not only, in our phraseology, permits sin, but even causes it as a punishment for previous sin. Comp. Rom. i. 24. also x., and Essay on Predestination. He hardens Pharaoh’s heart; He puts a lying spirit into the mouth of Ahab’s prophets. He designedly deceives those who deceive themselves.

To soften πέμπει into the sense of “permits to go,” or εἰς τὸ πιστεῦσαι into a mere result, is contrary to the use of language, as it is to the form of thought, in the age of the Apostle.

12. ἵνα κριθῶσιν πάντες.] There are altogether three stages mentioned:—First, they would not receive the truth; therefore, secondly, God sent them a delusion that, thirdly, they might be punished for their unbelief.

The prophecy of the man of sin may be summed up under the following heads:—

(1.) The man of sin is described as an apostasy, that is, as arising within the Church.

(2.) As sitting in the Temple of God, setting himself above all other religions, and founding a new one.

(3.) As delayed for a time by some thing or person.

(4.) As immediately preceding the coming of Christ.

13. Ἡμεῖς ζῇ,] sc. St. Paul, speaking of himself in the plural. As in chap. i. the punishment of the wicked recalls the Apostle to the salvation of his converts:

ableness of unrighteousness in them that perish ; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might
 11 be saved. And for this cause God doth send¹ them
 12 strong delusion, that they should believe a lie: that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness.

13 BUT we are bound to give thanks always to God for you, brethren beloved of the Lord, because God chose² you² a firstfruits to salvation through sanctification of
 14 the Spirit and belief of the truth: whereunto he called you by our gospel, to the obtaining of the glory of our

¹ Shall send.

² God hath from the beginning chosen you.

ver. 13. and 14. contrast with 11. and 12.

τῷ Θεῷ πάντοτε περὶ ὑμῶν. Compare Rom. i. 8.

ὅτι εἰλατο] gives the subject of his thankfulness.

ἀπαρχήν, *firstfruits*,] in comparison with the rest of the world. Comp. James, i. 18. ; Rom. viii. Another reading, of considerable authority, is ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, from the beginning: so, πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων, πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου. According to this reading, St. Paul turns aside to contemplate things "under the form of eternity," as they were from the beginning in the counsels of God. It would be natural to say, I thank God "that you received the word of truth." But the Apostle goes back to the first origin of things. They had received the word not of themselves, but of the grace of God, and then "known unto God are all his works from the beginning." There was a heavenly and eternal side to their admission to the Gospel, as well as an earthly and temporal.

ἐν ἀγιασμῷ πνεύματος καὶ πίστει ἀληθείας,] expresses, not the instrument by which God works, but the state into which he transforms those whom he chooses. We may regard the expression as one of St. Paul's "mixed modes," blending the word of God in itself with the word of God in the human heart.

14. εἰς ὅ, *unto all which*,] sc. ἀπαρχὴ εἰς σωτηρίαν, ἐν ἀγιασμῷ πνεύματος, κ. τ. λ.

εἰς περιποίησιν δόξης] is a resumption of εἰς σωτηρίαν in the previous verse. Of these words three principal explanations have been given:—First, God has been made the subject of περιποίησις, as though the words were ἵνα περιποίησθαι δόξαν τῷ κυρίῳ, that God may increase the glory of the Lord Jesus Christ. Secondly, περιποίησις is taken passively, and δόξα explained as a Hebrew genitive = for a glorious possession of the Lord. Thirdly, περιποίησις is taken actively, and δόξα, as elsewhere, for the glory of Christ in his kingdom, "to the attainment of the glory of the Lord."

χριστοῦ. ἄρα οὖν, ἀδελφοί, στήκετε, καὶ κρατεῖτε τὰς 15
 παραδόσεις ἃς ἐδιδάχθητε εἴτε διὰ λόγου εἴτε δι' ἐπιστολῆς
 ἡμῶν· αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς ὁ¹ χριστὸς καὶ [ὁ] 16
 θεὸς ὁ² πατὴρ ἡμῶν, ὁ ἀγαπήσας ἡμᾶς καὶ δούς παράκλησιν
 αἰωνίαν καὶ ἐλπίδα ἀγαθὴν ἐν χάριτι, παρακαλέσαι ὑμῶν 17
 τὰς καρδίας καὶ στηρίξαι³ ἐν παντὶ ἔργῳ καὶ λόγῳ⁴ ἀγαθῷ.

Τὸ λοιπὸν προσεύχεσθε, ἀδελφοί, περὶ ἡμῶν, ἵνα ὁ 3
 λόγος τοῦ κυρίου τρέχῃ καὶ δοξάζεται καθὼς καὶ πρὸς
 ὑμᾶς, καὶ ἵνα ῥυσθῶμεν ἀπὸ τῶν ἀτόπων καὶ πονηρῶν 2
 ἀνθρώπων. οὐ γὰρ πάντων ἡ πίστις. πιστὸς δὲ ἐστὶν ὁ 3

¹ Omit δ.² καί.³ Add ὑμᾶς.⁴ λόγῳ καὶ ἔργῳ.

The last explanation agrees best with the language, and also with the connexion, the drift of the passage being, to show the good portion of which the elect of Thessalonica were made partakers.

15. It might seem as if, when election is spoken of, God had already done all, and nothing was left for man to do. The opposite inference is that of the Apostle. Unconscious of what we should term the logical inconsistency, he immediately adds — "Stand fast therefore;" be not shaken in mind or troubled, and hold fast what I taught you, either by word, or by Epistle. You might be shaken if you did not know the purpose of God towards you; but knowing it, be therefore at rest.

16—17. The same thought is continued of the trouble and fear of the Church. "Be not soon shaken in your minds, but stand fast; and may our Lord Jesus Christ and God the Father, who loved us, comfort your hearts and establish you in all you do and say!"

παράκλησιν αἰωνίαν] not so much an indestructible consolation, al-

though this is of course involved in it, but rather a consolation that "reaches to the life that now is and to that which is to come."

The Greek philosopher would have spoken of wisdom as an *ἰατρικὴ ψυχῆς*, as we speak of the Gospel as remedial to the ills of human nature. St. Paul uses stronger language; with him the Gospel is a consolation. Within and without, the Christian is suffering in this evil world. The Gospel makes him sensible of this state, and at the same time turns his sorrow into joy. If his suffering abounds, his consolation much more abounds; and God, who is spoken of under so many titles as the Author of the Gospel, has this one especially in the writings of St. Paul, — that he is the God of all consolation. (Rom. xv. 5.; 2 Cor. i. 3.)

III. The Epistle as usual concludes with exhortation.

For what remains, says the Apostle, pray for us, and yet not for us, but for the success of the Gospel; and for us also, that we may be delivered from persecution, for all men have not faith. But faithful is God who will strengthen and deliver you from

- 15 Lord Jesus Christ. Therefore, brethren, stand fast, and
hold the lessons which ye have been taught, whether by
16 word, or our epistle. Now our Lord Jesus Christ him-
self, and God, even our Father, which hath loved us,
and hath given us everlasting consolation and good hope
17 through grace, comfort your hearts, and stablish you in
every good word and work.
- 3 Finally, brethren, pray for us, that the word of the
Lord may have free course, and be glorified, even as it
2 is with you : and that we may be delivered from un-
reasonable and wicked men : for all men have not faith.

the evil. And we have faith in the Lord, that ye will do as we exhort you, and may he guide your hearts to love God and abide patiently in Christ!

And what we do exhort you to, brethren, by the name ye bear, is to withdraw from the authors of confusion among you, who walk not according to the tradition they received of us. For ye know how far from disorder our walk was. We did not eat our bread for nothing, though we might have done so; but we worked with our own hands, partly for your example, partly to prevent our being burdensome to you. The reason why we say all this is, that we hear a report of certain disorderly members of the Church, who do no work but what is not their own. Such we exhort and desire in the Lord Jesus to work peaceably and get their own living. But, ye brethren, be not weary of setting the better example. And if there be others who will not follow it, and disobey this our present command, mark and avoid them, and yet remember

that they are not enemies, but brethren. And may the author of peace give you peace always everywhere!

1. Τὸ λοιπὸν may be translated "for what remains."

προσεύχεσθε . . . περὶ ἡμῶν, *pray for us.*] But for what? that the word of God may run and be glorified. It is after the manner of the Apostle, to put that as a wish for himself, which was a wish for the furtherance of the Gospel.

δοξάζηται. [Comp. Acts, xiii. 4. "And when the Gentiles heard this . . . they glorified the word of the Lord : " and for *τρέχη* Ps. cxlvii. 15. *ἕως τάχους δραμεῖται ὁ λόγος.* So, 2 Tim. ii. 9. : — ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ οὐ δέδεται.

2. καὶ ἵνα ῥυθωμῶμεν, *and that we may be delivered.*] The first thought of the Apostle was for the success of the Gospel; then followed the shrinking of the flesh from the dangers which awaited him. Comp. 2 Cor. ii. 1.

The same shrinking of the flesh is traceable elsewhere, in Rom. xv. 31.; 2 Cor. i. 8. It was not a fear of death, nor was

θεός¹, ὃς στηρίξει ὑμᾶς καὶ φυλάξει ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ. πεποιθामεν δὲ ἐν κυρίῳ ἐφ' ὑμᾶς, ὅτι ἂ παραγγέλλομεν [ὑμῖν καὶ ἐποιήσατε καί]² ποιεῖτε καὶ ποιήσετε. ὁ δὲ κύριος κατευθύνει ὑμῶν τὰς καρδίας εἰς τὴν ἀγάπην τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ εἰς τὴν³ ὑπομονὴν τοῦ χριστοῦ.

Παραγγέλλομεν δὲ ὑμῖν, ἀδελφοί, ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου [ἡμῶν] Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, στέλλεσθαι ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ παντὸς ἀδελφοῦ ἀτάκτως περιπατοῦντος καὶ μὴ κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν

¹ κύριος.² Omit ὑμῖν καὶ ἐποιήσατε καί.³ Omit τήν.

it merely the wish to be preserved for his master's service; but a natural human feeling, which, in later life, had passed away. (Phil. ii. 17.; 2 Tim. iv. 7.) It may be not unreasonably connected with his bodily presence, which his adversaries said was weak and his speech contemptible. (2 Cor. x. 10.) In this passage his words apply not to his opponents at Thessalonica, which he had left, but at Corinth, where he probably was at this time; to the false brethren whom he speaks of in 2 Corinthians. There would be a want of point in saying, οὐ γὰρ πάντων ἡ πίστις, of mere heathens or mere Jews. It would be like saying, Pray God to deliver me from my enemies, for all men are not Christians; or, Pray God to deliver me from Jews or heathens, for they are unconverted; the words, "for all have not faith," must apply to those who partly had, or might be expected to have faith. We are, therefore, led to infer that they refer to the false brethren, the apparent friends, but secret enemies, such as those who came in Gal. ii., to spy out the liberty of the Gospel, and were not separated by any marked line from the dis-

ciples. Supposing this view to be the true one, the words may be paraphrased as follows:—"Pray God that we may be delivered from evil men; for not all professors are true Christians."

3. Though men are unfaithful, yet God is faithful. Compare Rom. iii. 4. Though there are false brethren who have not the faith, yet God is faithful, and will deliver us from their falsehood. The connecting link between this verse and the preceding is formed by the two words *πίστις* and *πονηρός*.

Commentators are not agreed whether in the third verse the word *πονηροῦ* is to be taken as neuter or masculine; and whether, in the latter case, it refers to Satan or the man of sin, or is a collective name for the bad. The transition from the plural in the preceding verse to the singular is certainly possible: the vision of Antichrist may be again for a moment rising before the Apostle's eyes. But it is simpler to take the words as a neuter, "from their evil." It is an evil common to himself and them, and from which, feeling for them rather than for himself, he prays that they may be delivered.

3 But God¹ is faithful, who shall stablish you, and keep
4 you from evil. And we have confidence in the Lord
touching you, that ye both do and will do the things
5 which we command you and ye have done.² And the
Lord direct your hearts into the love of God, and into
the patient waiting for Christ.

6 Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our
Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from
every brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the

¹ The Lord.

² Omit and ye have done.

4. *πεποιθῶμεν δὲ ἐν κυρίῳ.*] Here, as elsewhere, the Apostle speaks of believing, hoping, doing all things in Christ. We lead an ordinary life as well as a religious one; but with the Apostle his ordinary life is his religious one, and hence he uses religious expressions in reference to all that he says and does.

ἐφ' ἑμᾶς] expresses that this confidence, though in the Lord, leans also on the Thessalonians themselves.

It is characteristic of St. Paul to admonish under the form of praise. As in familiar language, we say — “I am sure you will not do it,” with the meaning — “You ought not to do it.” So the Apostle is confident of his Thessalonian converts, meaning thereby to stablish them in the faith.

5. “I am confident,” the Apostle has just said, “you will do and are doing what I bid;” and yet, with a sort of happy inconsistency, he adds, — “May God perfect you !” They are to trust as he trusts, also to themselves; and still he prays God to guide their hearts into the love of God and the imitation of the patience of Christ, in

waiting for *his* appearing. Comp. 1 Thess. i. 10.

6. From the *ἡ παραγγέλλομεν* of the fourth verse, the Apostle passes on to particular instructions; *ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν* “I solemnly enjoin you.”

The remaining paragraph of this Epistle is important, as bearing on the degree and manner of authority which the Apostle exercised over the Churches. It seems to have been of a mixed kind, partly official and partly moral, springing from the sense of what the Apostle had done for the Church, in bringing them to the knowledge of the Lord Jesus, yet also claimed by him as a right. The only method of enforcing it was excommunication, the effect of which, in any state where the ecclesiastical had not also a share in the secular power, must have depended on feeling and opinion. Above all must this have been the case in the precarious state of the early Church. Nor must we be misled by the word “excommunication,” to suppose that in these times the thing existed in any definite form. There is no trace of exclusion from the Lord’s Sup-

ἣν παρελάβετε¹ παρ' ἡμῶν. αὐτοὶ γὰρ οἶδατε πῶς δεῖ 7
 μιμεῖσθαι ἡμᾶς, ὅτι οὐκ ἠτακτήσαμεν ἐν ὑμῖν, οὐδὲ δωρεὰν 8
 ἄρτον ἐφάγομεν παρά τινος, ἀλλ' ἐν κόπῳ καὶ μόχθῳ
 νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας² ἐργαζόμενοι, πρὸς τὸ μὴ ἐπιβαρῆσαι
 τινα ὑμῶν· οὐχ ὅτι οὐκ ἔχομεν ἐξουσίαν, ἀλλ' ἵνα ἑαυτῶν 9
 τύπον δώμεν ὑμῖν εἰς τὸ μιμεῖσθαι ἡμᾶς. καὶ γὰρ ὅτε ἦμεν 10
 πρὸς ὑμᾶς, τοῦτο παρηγγέλλομεν ὑμῖν, ὅτι εἴ τις οὐ θέλει
 ἐργάζεσθαι, μηδὲ ἐσθιέτω. ἀκούομεν γάρ τινας περιπα- 11
 τοῦντας ἐν ὑμῖν ἀτάκτως, μηδὲν ἐργαζομένους, ἀλλὰ περι-
 εργαζομένους· τοῖς δὲ τοιούτοις παραγγέλλομεν καὶ παρα- 12
 καλοῦμεν ἐν κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ χριστῷ³, ἵνα μετὰ ἡσυχίας
 ἐργαζόμενοι τὸν ἑαυτῶν ἄρτον ἐσθίωσιν. ὑμεῖς δέ, ἀδελφοί, 13

¹ παρέλαβε.² νύκτα καὶ ἡμέραν.³ διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ.

per being the mode of exclusion from the Church. The object was purely a moral one, and the form of withdrawal different in different cases. The incestuous person is to be delivered to Satan, for the destruction of the flesh. So Hymenæus and Philetus, "that they may learn not to blaspheme." In the Galatian Church, notwithstanding the rebellion against the Apostle's authority, nothing is said of his opponents ceasing to be the Church. In the Philippians, he tolerates those who preach "Christ of contention." To the Thessalonian Church he says, that if there are any wild enthusiasts neglecting their daily occupation, they are to hold no communication with them, as he wrote to the Corinthians, "not to keep company with fornicators." But it is remarkable that, in the Epistle in which this precept occurs, he says nothing of the expulsion of those who maintained that the Resurrection was passed already. 1 Cor. xv. 12.

στέλλεσθαι ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ παντὸς . . . ἀτάκτως.] Compare ὑποστέλλειν ἑαυτόν, Gal. ii. 12.

κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν, according to the lesson.] As in v. 10. he says, "While we were yet with you, this we commanded you, that, if a man will not work, neither let him eat." Comp. 1 Thes. iv. 11. 12.

7. In exhorting you not to be idle and walk disorderly, we do but exhort you to follow our example, who are not disorderly among you.

πῶς δεῖ μιμεῖσθαι ἡμᾶς] is a blending of two expressions. For ye yourselves know how ye ought to walk, and how, in walking uprightly, you follow our example.

8. Neither were we idle nor ate our bread for nothing, [receiving it] at the hands of any, but we ate it, toiling day and night that we might not be a burden to any. Comp. 1 Cor. ix., where the Apostle adopts the same tone. He might claim support of them, but he would not; and the very fact of his not doing so they seem to have turned into

7 lesson * which ye¹ received of us. For yourselves know
8 how ye ought to follow us: for we behaved not ourselves
disorderly among you; neither did we eat any man's
bread for nought; but wrought with labour and travail
night and day, that we might not be chargeable to any
9 of you: not because we have not power, but to make
10 ourselves an ensample unto you to follow us. For² when
we were with you, this we commanded you, that if any
11 would not work, neither should he eat. For we hear
that * there are some which walk among you disorderly,
12 busy only with what is not their own business. Now
them that are such we command and exhort in the³
Lord Jesus Christ, that with quietness they work, and
13 eat their own bread. But ye, brethren, be not weary

¹ He.

² Add. even.

³ By our.

a charge against him, of not being an Apostle. So here he guards, in the following verse, against this being construed into a giving up of his authority.

9. οὐχ ὅτι οὐκ ἔχομεν.] I do not mean to say that I have no right or power to claim support from you, but I give up the right that I may be an example to you. οὐχ ὅτι implies a restriction on what preceded.

10. καὶ γάρ, *for even*.] For while we were with you, we gave you not only example but precept to the effect, that if one would not work, neither let him eat. The καὶ connects with the 6th and 7th verses; while the γάρ gives the reason or proof of what preceded. We exhort you, and while we were with you we exhorted you, which last is also the proof that it was only as an example we wronged ourselves.

There is a distinction between the minister and the hearer of the Gospel, the clergy and the laity, the Apostle and the disciple; and St. Paul, as a preacher of the Gospel, makes himself as the hearer "to win some."

11. For we hear that there are some among you who walk disorderly, doing nothing but what is useless, busy only with what is not their own business. Comp. Quintilian. "Afer venuste Mallium Suram multum in agendo discursantem, salientem, manus jactantem, togam dejicientem et reponentem, non agere dixit sed satagere." Compare also Plato's definition of σωφροσύνη τὰ ἑαυτοῦ πράττειν. See note on the paronomasia of St. Paul's Epistle, vol. ii.

12. μετὰ ἡσυχίας is opposed to περιεργία, as ἑαυτῶν ἄπρον to μηδὲν ἐργαζόμενοι, "without raising a disturbance."

μὴ ἐγκακήσητε καλοποιούντες. εἰ δέ τις οὐχ ὑπακούει τῷ 14
 λόγῳ ἡμῶν διὰ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς, τοῦτον σημειοῦσθε μὴ
 συναναμίγνυσθαι αὐτῷ, ἵνα ἐντραπῇ· καὶ μὴ ὡς ἐχθρὸν 15
 ἡγείσθε, ἀλλὰ νουθετεῖτε ὡς ἀδελφόν. αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ κύριος 16
 τῆς εἰρήνης δώῃ ὑμῖν τὴν εἰρήνην διὰ παντὸς ἐν παντὶ
 τόπῳ.² ὁ κύριος μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν.

Ὁ ἀσπασμὸς τῇ ἐμῇ χειρὶ Παύλου, ὃ ἐστὶν σημεῖον ἐν 17
 πάσῃ ἐπιστολῇ. οὕτως γράφω. ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν 18
 Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν. ἀμήν.³

¹ καὶ μὴ συναναμίγνυσθε.

² τρόπῳ.

³ Add Πρὸς Θεσσαλονικεῖς δευτέρα ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Ἀθηνῶν.

13. μὴ ἐγκακήσητε καλοποιούν-
 τες.] After rebuking some for
 giving up their daily employ-
 ments, for not eating in the sweat
 of their brow, he passes on to en-
 treat those who had not incurred
 the reproof, to continue as they
 were, not to be weary of well
 doing.

14. This verse has received
 three explanations, the first two
 of which need only be mentioned
 to be set aside:—(1.) Indicate
 this man to me by letter, which
 is equally objectionable, on the

ground of the sense and of the
 language. (2.) Set a mark on
 this man by the Epistle, i. e.,
 pointing out what precept in the
 Epistle he has disobeyed, which
 is over-refined and farfetched.
 The obvious explanation is the
 true one:—"Set a mark upon this
 man and hold no intercourse with
 him;" the words, τῷ λόγῳ ἡμῶν
 διὰ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς, "to our word
 as communicated in this Epistle,"
 being taken with ὑπακούει.

15. καὶ is used here instead of
 ἀλλά, as this verse is really adver-

14 in well doing. And if any man obey not our word by
this epistle, note that man, and have no company with
15 him, that he may be ashamed. Yet count him not as
16 an enemy, but admonish him as a brother. And * may
the Lord of peace himself give you peace always every-
where.¹ The Lord be with you all.

17 The salutation of Paul with mine own hand, which is
18 the token in every epistle: so I write. The grace of
our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all. Amen.²

¹ By all means.

² Add The second epistle to the Thessalonians was written from Athens.

sative to the preceding. The meaning is:—"Hold no intercourse with the man, but do not count him as an enemy, but admonish him as a brother." The flaw may have arisen from the antithetical negative and positive form of ver. 15. Or the Apostle may not feel the first thought and afterthought to be inconsistent; or *καὶ* may be used in consequence of the coming *ἀλλά*.

16. *αὐτός δέ*] partly expresses the earnestness of the Apostle's prayer, and is in part opposed to peace obtained by merely human

efforts. "Have peace among yourselves, and may the Lord himself give you peace!" a valediction not without a latent allusion to the disorder of the Church.

17. *ὁ ἀσπασμός*.] See note at the end of the Epistle to the Galatians. *ὁ* refers to the sentence preceding, and not to the word *ἀσπασμός*, comp. ii. 14.

18. *μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν*,] not with the disorderly members, as well as with those who walk orderly, but as above (i. 3.), pleonastic.

ON THE MAN OF SIN.

WHETHER the prophecy of the man of sin is fulfilled or unfulfilled, — whether it is to be explained from the immediate circle of the Apostle's life, or from the distant future, — whether it relates to an individual or to an idea, to the Pharisees or to the Gnostics, — whether the man of sin himself be Nero as Chrysostom imagined, or the impersonation of heresy as Theodoret and others, or the pope as the reformers, or the reformers as the pope, or Mahomet as the Greek Church, or the Emperor Caligula as Grotius, or Titus as Wetstein, or Simon Magus as Hammond, or Simon the son of Gioras as Usteri and Le Clerc, or some embodiment or power of evil, which has not yet been realised in the world, as was the opinion of several of the Fathers; — whether that which letteth, and he which letteth, and will let until he be taken out of the way, is the Roman Empire, as was also a common opinion of the Fathers, or the German Empire, as was maintained by the early opponents of the papacy, or the time appointed of God, as was held by Theodore of Mopsuestia and Theodoret, or the outpouring of spiritual gifts as Chrysostom inclined to think, or Nero as Wetstein, or Vitellius as Grotius, or St. Paul himself as a recent interpreter; — whether the temple of God is the Christian Church or the actual temple at Jerusalem, or both, or neither; — whether the coming of Christ be His coming to judge the world, or the anticipation of that judgment in the destruction of Jerusalem; — are the principal questions which in ancient or modern times have been raised by interpreters respecting the second chapter of the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians.

Most of these questions may be set aside, as having no real bearing upon the interpretation of the Epistle. They are not found but

brought there. When it is remembered that at this period of his life, St. Paul himself expected "to remain and be alive" (1 Thess. iv. 17.) in the day of the Lord, and that he expressly states that the coming of Christ was to be preceded by Antichrist, and that the coming of Antichrist was again restrained by that which let, it is obvious that our interpretation must be confined within very narrow bounds, that is within ten, twenty, or thirty years at the utmost, if it be not that the acts of the drama are contemporary or certainly very near, "for the mystery of iniquity already worketh." It is not, therefore, in the wider sphere of the history of the world, but in the life of the Apostle, in the cities of Asia or Judea, perhaps at Rome in the days of Caligula or Nero, that we must look for the events, or shadow of events, which form the basis of the prophecy.

It is necessary to warn the reader, that we are not about to add another to the multitude of guesses which exist already. Our inquiry will relate rather to the style and structure of the prophecy, than to the opinions of interpreters respecting the facts which may be regarded as its fulfilment. The real facts may not have been recorded; they may have been too minute to be observed by us; they may also have been transfigured before the spiritual eye, until they are no longer recognisable as historical events. It is little we are attempting, not the solution of a riddle, or the reading of a hieroglyphic, but the comparison of one part of Scripture with another; and the comprehension of it, if possible, not in the letter but in the spirit.

"The man of sin" is not a mere detached prophecy. It formed a leading subject of the Apostle's teaching. He introduces it with express reference to the fact, that on his visit to the Thessalonians he had warned them of it; and this not only in general terms, but with special mention of the times of his appearing, and the influences by which his revelation was withheld. "Remember ye not, that when I was yet with you I told you these things?" What he had told them is contained in the description which precedes, and which is extremely definite and precise; that man of sin, "the son of

perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God." All this was not new to the Thessalonians converts, they even knew of that which withheld, that he might be revealed in his own time. The Apostle adds a few other traits in the verses which follow; "whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power and lying signs and wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish."

The sources of our information are so limited, that we are able to pronounce at once, that we know of no person or power existing in the lifetime of the Apostle, to which most of the above features will apply. We cannot say that "the man of sin" was Caligula, whose reign had terminated twelve years before this; or Nero, who might have still been "a delight of the human race;" or Simon the son of Gioras, the leader of the fanatics at Jerusalem, who had hardly come forth into public view; still less Vitellius, Vespasian, or Titus. Such guesses are only more probable than the wider ones, because they relate to persons who were actually or almost within the horizon of the Apostle's view; but they are quite inconsistent with the general character of the prophecy, and offer no remarkable coincidences with its several details. In any succession of historical events, it is possible to find good and evil, order and anarchy, a king and a usurper, a lawless force and a restraining power; just as in any religious crisis, it is easy to array one principle against another, while it is possible to regard the governments of the world as "a let" to either. But coincidences of this sort, which apply to all the world and to human nature generally, are not of a kind to enable us to fix with precision the meaning of a prophecy.

If, confessing that no known person or event agreed with the description of the prophecy, we were to try another method, and to interpret the second chapter of the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians entirely from itself, we should probably infer that, by the terms "man of sin," "son of perdition," St. Paul had in view a real person, and that by his "sitting in the temple of God" was meant

literally his enthronement in the temple at Jerusalem, which was still standing. Nothing in the description is inconsistent with such an interpretation, which the very grossness of the delusion which is ascribed to those who believe tends rather to confirm. At the same time, it would have to be admitted that the being who is thus described is not a mere ordinary individual, coming forth from the the crowd, and declaring himself to be a God, any more than he is a statue of wood or stone. He is the author or symbol of a spiritual evil, a mysterious power already working beneath the ground, and waiting for an opportunity to appear—a false Christ or false prophet, a Simon Magus, an Elcasai, or a Barcochab. The founder of a false religion, claiming divine honours, announcing himself as the new God of the Jewish Temple, influencing the minds of men by every sort of magic art and spiritual deception, would most adequately correspond, in all points, to the description of the Apostle. Such a one, he would seem to say, was to exist for a short time, and then vanish away, not before the superior power of truth, but before the actual force of Christ and his angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance.

Natural as such an interpretation may appear, it would probably be erroneous, and for this reason, that, like many other interpretations of prophecy, it would rest too much on the words themselves, without considering the style of the language or the parallelisms in St. Paul's own writings. The first question respecting all prophecies is, whether the language of them is figurative or literal, or how far figurative and how far literal. Figurative language will commonly detect itself, as in the trumpets, vials, numbers, of the Book of Revelation. The very symmetry of it will indicate its true nature. Events in history are not carried on by sevens, or by twelves; nor are they exactly limited by periods of time. Nor are the powers of nature or the kingdoms of this world divisible into four or ten. Accordingly, in such instances, we readily separate the framework and compartments of the picture from the life and motion of the figures. But there are other passages in which the form and

the thought are more closely united, in which the garment clings to the person, and cannot be put off without destroying the life of the prophecy. Interpretation of prophecy will, in these cases, be an imperfect analysis of what it is really impossible to analyse. Especially will this be so where the figures are traditional, and have acquired from use and familiarity a sort of permanent and historical character. The vision of events themselves is then circumscribed by the circle of prophetic symbols.

Taking in this most important element, we find in Ezekiel and Daniel, in the discourses of our Lord respecting the end of the world, in the Epistles to the Thessalonians and to Timothy, as well as in the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude, and in the Book of Revelation, a series of images of the evil which was to come upon the world in the latter days, all together furnishing a sort of chain of prophecy between the Old Testament and the New, which gradually extends and seems to pass from the realms of history into the spiritual and unseen world. One of the first links in this chain is Ezekiel's description of Gog and Magog, the symbol of the tribes of the North whom God will bring against the land of Israel, that he may be glorified in their destruction (xxxviii. 16, 17.). This prophecy, which is the beginning of so many others, itself implies that it was not uttered by Ezekiel for the first time:—"Art thou he of whom I have spoken in old time by my servants the prophets of Israel, which prophesied in those days many years that I would bring thee against them." (Compare Jer. ii.—iv.) Naturally the minds of the Jewish prophets in Babylon had been led to dwell on the powers of the North, since the Scythian tribes had spread themselves over Asia. Where could they find a more striking image of the power of God than in this mighty people, "covering" the world "like a cloud," and suddenly, like a cloud, passing away,—which had probably in Josiah's reign overspread Palestine itself? They had almost been seen by Ezekiel in the days of his youth, and the remembrance of them had stamped themselves for ages on the Eastern world. His prophecy of them is

little more than history, inspired only by the consciousness that there is one that ruleth among the children of men. There is no indication that Gog is other than a person, the chief prince of Meshech and Tubal. Nor is there apparently any form of spiritual evil that is symbolised in him ; he is but the great enemy of Israel, who comes up with all his hosts against the people of God.

Next in the series are the prophecies of Daniel, respecting the little horn and the kings of the North and South (vii. and xi.), which though retaining a certain degree of resemblance to the prophecy of Ezekiel, present also a very striking difference. It is a difference not merely in subject, but in spirit. We seem as if we had advanced another step in the revelation of God to man ; with the vision of the kingdoms of this world mingles also the vision of the final judgment. It is readily acknowledged that the Evangelical prophecies of the Old Testament form a link with the New. Not less is this true of the Apocalyptic prophecies also. As the former anticipate the moral nature of Messiah's kingdom, so do the latter anticipate the universality of the Gospel. No two books of the Old Testament itself bear a closer resemblance to each other, than the book of Daniel, the Apocalypse of the Old Testament, and the book of Revelation, which may be termed by its Greek name the Apocalypse of the New. Were the one placed at the end of the Old Testament, and the other at the beginning of the New, they would seem more than any of the canonical writings, to bridge the chasm which separates, or appears to separate, the two parts of the Sacred Volume. Both alike differ from the older prophecies, in extending the purposes of God to all time and to all mankind. The earlier history of the Jews was itself a kind of prophecy, the earlier prophecies were a kind of history of the Jews and their neighbours. There was a time when other nations seemed to be too far out of the way, to share in the mercies and judgments of God. But now the prophet lifted up his eyes east and west, north and south, to all countries of the earth, and saw in the history of the world the prelude to the final judgment.

This is the kind of difference which separates the two prophecies

of Daniel from that of Ezekiel respecting Gog and Magog. The one is a part of the history of the Jews; the other is a prophecy of the latter days, an anticipation of the judgment to come. That of Ezekiel is the germ of the other, and stands in the same relation to it, as the vision of the dry bones in the same prophet, to the description of the general resurrection in the seventh and twelfth chapters of Daniel, or the vision of the Temple and the portions of the tribes, to the new Jerusalem and the 144,000, in the Book of Revelation. In Ezekiel we have not yet burst the bonds of the temporal dispensation; in Daniel we already pass within the veil into another world. They occupy different places in Jewish history, the very dispersion of the Jews in Asia and Egypt tending to break down the force of local feelings and leading them to include all nations within the circle of God's providence.

Parallel with this enlargement of the symbols of prophecy is the new and nobler meaning which is given to the worship of the tabernacle and to the Jewish history, in the Epistle to the Hebrews. A light is shed on both, derived, perhaps, from a wider experience of mankind, yet not the less coming down "from the author and father of lights." First the prophets, then the law, become instinct with the life of the Gospel. The only difference is that in prophecy the new takes the place of the old, in a more gradual and less perceptible manner. The law is done away in Christ; the temple made with hands is destroyed, that another temple, not made with hands, may be raised up; and the discourses of Christ respecting the end of the world, gather together in one all the threads of Old Testament prophecy.

Thus, through the whole of the books of Scripture, from the earliest to the latest, the spirit of prophecy might be said to be changing with the increasing purpose of God to man. But though the spirit changed, the imagery remained the same. The two prophecies which have been referred to, present more than one minute similarity with the second chapter of the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians; as, for example, the insolence and impiety of the king

of the South, "who shall exalt and magnify himself above every God," xi. 36., which may be compared with 2 Thess. ii. 4., "Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God or worshipped," and "the pollution of the sanctuary of strength, and the abomination of desolation standing in the holy place," xi. 31., quoted by our Lord, which recalls "the man of sin sitting in the temple of God." It is not quite certain, nor is it important for our object to know what was the original meaning of the passages of Daniel; but whether they allude to the kings of Syria and Egypt, or in part also to the Romans, or relate to some unknown course of events, their original meaning in the Book of Daniel has no necessary connexion with their use and application by the Apostle. We might say, in the language of Bossuet, that St. Paul spoke by the spirit of Daniel, as St. Peter spoke by the mouth of Joel on the day of Pentecost, or as St. John himself spoke by the spirit of Ezekiel in Rev. xx. 8., where the names Gog and Magog are retained, though the meaning is generalised. Many other instances may be found in which the general subject is changed, though the ornaments remain. The same symbols which once referred to the Temple or to the tribes of Israel, are again employed, without any precise meaning, of the Church and the world at large.

It does not, therefore, follow, that, because the words of the prophecy of Daniel, or of our Lord, refer to the Romans, that they necessarily received this explanation from St. Paul, any more than in the Book of Revelation, because mention is made of the hundred and forty and four thousand of the tribes of Israel, it follows that salvation was first to be given to the house of Israel. The forms of good and evil are idealised in the language of prophecy. The same images are handed down from one generation of prophets to another; but the state of the world, which is symbolised by them, may change and become different. As in the interpretation of prophecy, many successions of events have, in different ages of the world, been thought to correspond with the words of Daniel, or of the Apocalypse; so with the prophets themselves, there is a growth and adaptation of

the same prophecy to various stages of human history. Not only are there many mirrors of the meaning of prophecy in the history of the world, but more than this—the last prophecy is itself, as it were, the glass through which the prophet looks forward into the future.

Hence the imagery of a prophecy in the New Testament will not be the clue to its true nature. Nay, it may be very far removed from it, sometimes even absolutely opposed to it. For it may refer to what is literal and historical, but the thing signified in the New Testament may be spiritual and ideal. Ordinary quotations from the Old Testament are to be explained by their context in the New Testament, not by their place in the Old. The same rule is applicable to the prophecies of the Old Testament when transferred to the New. In both, the spirit has commonly taken the place of the letter, the evangelical truth has lighted up the prophetic symbol. So that the true key to the interpretation of a prophecy of St. Paul, is not the meaning of the same imagery in the Old Testament, but the character of his own writings, "*Non, nisi ex ipso Paulo, Paulum potes interpretari.*" The special meaning is to be gathered from those points which he has distinct from the Old Testament, rather than those which he has in common with it. We do not feel certain that the man of sin, sitting in the temple of God, is more than a personification of the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet; suggested, perhaps, by the worship of the Emperor which St. Paul had seen in the cities to which he had travelled, or by the attempt of Caligula, a few years previously, to place his statue in the temple at Jerusalem. But he that "letteth, and will let, until he be taken out of the way," and the lying signs and wonders, with which the man of sin was to be accompanied, are traits not found in Ezekiel and Daniel, some of which are found elsewhere in his Epistles. Here, then, whether we are able to discern it or not, is something which we may naturally look for, not in the clouds of heaven, but in the history of the Apostolic age.

In many other places of the New Testament, and even of the writings of St. Paul himself, mention occurs of strange forms of

evil. It is remarkable that all of them are spiritual. There are differences in the description of them, not unlike the difference which we may suppose to have existed between the author of the Epistles in which they are spoken of, St. Paul, and St. John; but they nowhere convey the impression that they represent political changes or revolutions in the kingdoms of men. The one Apostle is, as it were, hastening, amid many impediments, to the coming of the day of the Lord; the other is calmly waiting for the events that must shortly come to pass. Both seem to feel the evil of the world as a sign of "the last time;" the one, near and present, as if involved in the conflict; the other, far off, separated from it rather than warring with it. Already there are many Antichrists, says St. John, and "Antichrist is he that denieth the Father and the Son." So in the Epistle to Timothy iv. 1—3. it is said, "that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils speaking lies in hypocrisy, having their conscience seared with a hot iron, forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them which believe and know the truth." Compare 2 Tim. iii. 1. The Apostle appears to apprehend the same danger in Col. ii. 8. 16. And in the Second Epistle of Peter ii. 1., iii. 3., there is the same pervading idea of the latter days, in which "false prophets shall rise up, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, denying the Lord that bought them." The evil of which the New Testament prophecies speak, is not the idolatry of the heathen, nor the conquests of great empires, but the apostasy of sometime believers, or the fanaticism of the Jews. Of something of this kind, not of Roman governors, or Jewish high priests, the Apostle is speaking when he says:—"We wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in heavenly places." He is no longer walking upon the earth, and only in a figure beholds the things of earth.

Such passages are a much safer guide to the interpretation of the

one we are considering, than the meaning of similar passages in the Old Testament. For they indicate to us the habitual thought of the Apostle's mind ; " a falling away first," suggested, probably, by the wavering which he saw around him among his own converts, the grievous wolves that were entering into the church of Ephesus, Acts xx. 29. ; the turning away of all them of Asia, in 2 Tim. i. 15. When we consider that his own converts, and his Jewish opponents, or half converts, were all the world to him, that through them, as it were in a glass, he appeared to himself to see the workings of human nature generally, we understand how this double image of good and evil should have presented itself to him, and the kind of necessity which he felt that Christ and Antichrist should alternate with each other. It was not that he foresaw some great conflict, decisive of the destinies of mankind. What he anticipated far more nearly resembled the spiritual combat in the seventh chapter of the Romans. It was the same struggle, written in large letters, as Plato might have said, not on the tables of the heart, but on the scene around ; the world turned inside out, as it might be described ; evil as it is in the sight of God, and as it realises itself to the conscience, putting on an external shape, transforming itself into a person.

Separating the prophecy, then, into two parts, its external form and internal meaning, the one part is to be explained from the Old Testament ; that is to say, it is the repetition of the images of Ezekiel and Daniel, which naturally receive a more precise character from the associations of the time in which St. Paul lived ; while the other part, or inward meaning, is to be illustrated by other passages in St. Paul's own writings, in which he speaks of the perilous times of the latter days ; of false prophets transforming themselves into Apostles of Christ ; of Satan transfigured into an angel of light ; of religious licentiousness ; of all them of Asia falling away from him. Of all these opponents of the Gospel the man of sin is the concentrated image ; they are already working, but are at present underground, not yet bursting forth to envelope mankind. Gnosticism, or Orientalism, or Judaism, the evil of the world as it awoke to the conscious-

ness of higher truths, the darkness which was felt only by the manifestation of light, are all included. Looking at all from a distance, the Apostle seemed to see in them the impersonation of evil.

The personification is characteristic of the age; it is also characteristic of the Apostle. Sin, the law, faith, love, the old man, the new man, are all personified by him. Of the same kind is the figure by which he speaks of "the man of sin," "the son of perdition." There is yet another point in which we seem to see a trace in this passage (shall we say of the mode of speech or of thought?) of the Apostle and his age, viz. in its alternating or antithetical character. The coming of the Lord and the revelation of the man of sin, Christ and Antichrist, are opposed to each other by a sort of necessity, as the revelation of wrath and mercy, the law and faith, Adam and Christ, in the Epistle to the Romans. Like the shadow and light, they are never separate, equally dividing the world or following one another. And the symbols of the Old Testament itself are not merely borrowed from Daniel and Ezekiel, but receive a new colour and association from passing events, such as the worship of the emperors, and in particular the attempt of Caligula to place his statue in the temple at Jerusalem.

Thus there are altogether four elements which enter into the conception of the man of sin:—(1.) the traditional imagery of the elder prophets; (2.) the style of the Apostle and his age; (3.) the impression of recent historical events which supply the form; (4.) the state of the world and the Church, and the consciousness that, where good is, evil must ever be in aggravated proportions, which supply the matter of the prophecy.

Still we have not made a nearer approach to the true interpretation of "him that letteth," an expression on which no light is thrown, either by the writings of St. Paul, or by the symbolical language of the Old Testament. We cannot err in supposing that it intimates St. Paul's belief that the coming of Antichrist was not yet. Though already working, it was restrained by a superior power. The Thesalonians were exhorted not to be troubled in mind, as though the

day of the Lord was at hand, for it was to be preceded by the manifestation of the man of sin. But it was still further delayed by the interposition of "him that letteth." So far all is consistent. Christ, Antichrist, the restrainer of Antichrist, are the triple links of the chain by which the world is held together. In what person or thing to find the last of the three is the point of difficulty.

No stress can be laid on the use of the masculine "him that letteth," because it is immediately followed by that of the neuter, "that which letteth," and may be easily accounted for by parallelism with the man of sin in a preceding verse. More truly might it be argued that the use of the neuter excludes the idea of a person. Nero might have been *ὁ κατέχων*, but could not have been *τὸ κατέχον*. The double use of the masculine and the neuter seems in some degree to favour the interpretation of the prophecy which identifies the Roman empire with the restraining power. At any rate, some interpretation is necessary, which would apply to a thing as well as to a person, as, for example, in the case of the Roman empire, *τὸ κατέχον* and *ὁ κατέχων* may contain an allusion to the empire and to the emperor. A more important circumstance than this strikes us in the examination of the passage: it is the apparent secrecy which the Apostle observes in speaking of the restraining power. It is an enigma which he will not reveal, which he had explained while he was yet with them, and dare not now write "with pen and ink." It reminds us of the number of the beast in the Book of Revelation. It recalls the words of Daniel, xii. 10. :—"None of the wicked shall understand, but the wise shall understand." It quickens our curiosity to know what that power could have been, which was contemporary with the Apostle, and which he would not openly mention to his converts.

Two answers suggest themselves; conjectures, it is true, because it is impossible to do more than form conjectures which may be consistent or not inconsistent with the spirit of the prophecy; but they are not, however, to be rejected on that ground, if nothing better can be offered. The first is the Roman empire; the second,

the Jewish law. The reasons are obvious, in either case, why the Apostle should have concealed his meaning. According to the view which separates the traditional form from the substance of the prophecy, it would be no fatal objection to the first of these two interpretations, that the figure of Antichrist himself is taken from the image of the Roman emperors sitting in the temples as gods, while he that letteth is again the Roman emperor regarded from a new point of view. More real is the difficulty of supposing that St. Paul could have expected that, within a few years, the solid frame of the Roman empire was to break up and pass away. It is unlikely that he should have even taken the kingdoms of this world into the horizon of his spiritual vision. To say that the heresies of the Ebionites or Nicolaitanes were restrained by the continuance of the Roman government, is extremely far-fetched: the two are not "*in pari materiâ*." It would remove this difficulty if we could suppose the revelation of the man of sin to represent the rebellion of the Jews, but would leave the original one, how to account for the mystery which the Apostle observes about him which letteth. More natural is it to explain "that which letteth" as the Jewish law, the check on spiritual licentiousness which for a little while was holding in its chains the swarms of Jewish heretics, who were soon to be let loose and sweep over the earth. Whatever other objections may be entertained to the last of the two interpretations, it has, at any rate, the advantage of consistency. It does not confuse the spiritual and historical, or take us away from the world of the human heart of which the Scripture speaks, to the world of objects and events.

Good and evil seem often to lie together flat upon the world's surface. At other times they start up, like armed men, and prepare for the last struggle. There is a state in the individual soul, in which it has entered into rest, and has its conversation in heaven, and is a partaker of the kingdom of God. There is a state also in which it is divided between two, not unconscious of good, but overpowered by evil, living in what St. Paul terms the body of death. There is a third state in which it is neither conscious of good nor overpowered by evil, but in

which it "leads the life of all men" acting under the influence of habit, law, opinion. All these three states have their parallels in the history of the world. In all of them, whether in the individual or in the world, whether arising out of the purpose of God or the nature of man, there sometimes seems to be a kind of necessity which will not suffer them to be other than they are. The first is that state for which the believer looks when the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of God and Christ. The second is that state of the world, seen also to him, but unseen to men in general, in which, in the language of prophecy, "the wicked is revealed," in which the elements of good and evil separate and decompose themselves, in anticipation of the final judgment. The third is that fixed order of the world in which we live, which surrounds us on every side with its restraints, social, legal, moral, which, if it be not very good, is not very evil; which "letteth and will let" as long as human nature lasts. Such "a let" to the evil of men was the Roman empire; such "a let," even when it had lost its inspired character, was the law of the Jews. Whether either of these, or both of them combined in the same way that in the Book of Revelation Rome and Jerusalem combine to form the image of the last enemy, suggested to the Apostle the thought of "that which let;" whether the political order of the world, which was typified by them, seemed to him for a time to interpose itself against the manifestation of evil, is uncertain. Such is a natural adaptation for us to make of the words of the prophecy; it is also a consistent interpretation of it.

THE EPISTLE
TO
THE GALATIANS.

THE
EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS.

INTRODUCTION.

THE Epistle to the Galatians is the most personal of all the Epistles of St. Paul. The occasion out of which it arose, was the relapse of the Galatian converts into the observance of the law of Moses, which appears to have been accompanied by a disavowal of the authority of the Apostle. Their conduct cut him to the heart, both as an injustice to himself, and an injury to the truth which he preached. On hearing of their desertion, he addressed them in the Epistle, in which he sets forth his own claims to be an Apostle, and first, arguing with them out of the law, and in sorrow rather than anger at their folly, shows them that they are in a false position.. There was no half way, such as they supposed. If they were circumcised, Christ would profit them nothing. Faith had nothing in common with the law ; both together were inconsistent and incompatible.

Before we can rightly apprehend the relation of the Apostle to his converts, some preliminary questions have to be discussed, relating not only to the position which St. Paul occupied in reference to the twelve, which is made the subject of a separate inquiry, but also to the origin and character of the Galatian Church. The answer to such questions is to be sought chiefly in the indications of the Epistle itself, with the assistance of the Acts of the Apostles ; to which some further light may be added from the analogy of other writings of the Apostle, and of other Churches mentioned in them. A gleam of uncertain information may also be gathered from the

history of Galatia itself, the character of the inhabitants of which may not improbably appear in the fitful temper of the Apostle's converts.

Two questions, closely connected with each other, meet us at the outset in any inquiry into the circumstances of the Churches to which the Epistles of St. Paul are addressed : — First, whether the Church was founded by the Apostle himself; secondly, whether it was composed of Jewish or Gentile Christians. To neither of these questions is it possible, in the case of the Epistle to the Galatians, to give a perfectly certain and definite answer. A writing so short could hardly be expected to do more than offer materials for conjecture on a subject only incidentally referred to in it. On the one hand, the tone of authority which the Apostle adopts, as well as particular expressions in the Epistle, such as iii. 2. (" This only would I learn of you, Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith ? "); or iv. 9—19. in which the Apostle speaks of their having been converted, not to bondage, but to freedom ; as well as the manner in which he mentions the Apostles at Jerusalem in chap. ii. would certainly lead us to suppose that the Galatians must have been converted by himself or by his followers. On the other hand, they were as certainly Gentiles, as we gather from chap. iv. ver. 8. : — " When ye knew not God, ye did service unto them which by nature are no gods." But if they were converts of the Apostle, how are we to account for their ready reception of Jewish errors, except on one of two suppositions ? that they were originally Jews, and readily relapsed into Judaism, which however we have seen was not the case ; or that, like some other Churches, they had passed through a phase of Judaism before their conversion to Christianity. Naturally, it might be urged, when the Apostle's personal influence was withdrawn from them, they returned to their Jewish masters. And this latter view is confirmed by the fact, that though they were Gentiles, yet the Apostle argues with them as if they were Jews, out of the law and the prophets, and that in none of his Epistles has the cast of the reasoning a more Jewish character.

The fairest way of stating the two questions is to consider them together. One set of presumptions leads to the first conclusion, that the Galatians were Gentiles ; or rather the text quoted above, at

iv. 8., expressly says so. Another set of presumptions (from which we cannot exclude the almost equally explicit statement that they were Jews, chap. iv. 9., and desirous to return to the beggarly elements around which their hearts still lingered) leads to the opposite conclusion. Out of this dilemma how are we to make our escape? (1.) Can we suppose St. Paul himself to have been a teacher of the law (Compare Introductory Essay on the Epistle to the Thessalonians), and to have once taught what he now denounced? Admitting that at no period of his life he wholly ceased to be a Jew (Acts xviii. 18., xxi. 26., xxiii. 6.); that there were threads in his doctrine, which entangled him with the false teachers (Gal. v. 11.); that the constant reference to the Old Testament may, of itself, have led to misconception; still the extreme antagonism in which he places himself to the Judaisers, renders it impossible that he could ever have been one of them, and least of all at so late a date as his first visit to Galatia. The Galatians "had begun in the Spirit;" he had never preached to them Christ "according to the flesh;" it is another Gospel to which they are "removed," so different that they had learned to hate their former teacher, out of dislike to his doctrine. (2.) But if we cannot suppose St. Paul himself to have been a Judaising teacher, whence did the infection of Judaism arise in the Churches of Galatia? It might be suggested that, like the Roman Church, the Galatians were first converted by teachers of the circumcision, and afterwards reconverted by St. Paul. Yet, in Gal. i. 6., iii. 2., the Apostle implies that they were first converted by himself, and, as he expresses it in the passage just quoted, "began in the spirit." Or, (3.) shall we conceive him to be describing, first, the Gentiles, then the Jews in successive verses? Granting that the Church consisted of both Jewish and Gentile Christians, still the context shows that those who were led away by dumb idols, and those who were ready to relapse into the weak and beggarly elements of the law, were the same persons, iv. 8—10. Yet, (4.) once more it might be argued, that Judaism and heathenism were regarded by St. Paul as a single prior dispensation, the two parts of which he is not careful to distinguish, which he seems alike to include elsewhere in the expression "elements of the world," Col. ii. 8. 20. But no such common point of view under

which he may have regarded the former estate of Jew and Gentile, would have justified him in saying of the Jew:—"Howbeit then, when ye knew not God, ye did service unto them which by nature are no gods."

The most probable mode of escaping these difficulties is the following:—The Galatians we may suppose to have been a Gentile Church, which was first converted to Christianity by St. Paul, but previous to its conversion had gone through a phase of Judaism. There were three states out of which Gentile converts passed, or might have passed, into the acceptance of the Gospel as preached by St. Paul:—first, heathenism; secondly, a more or less strict proselytism; thirdly, Jewish Christianity. The second of these was probably the state of the Galatian converts. Strange as it may seem, it is an undoubted fact that, already before the appearance of Christianity the religion of the Jews exercised a great and mysterious influence over the Roman world. It had already bridged the chasm which separated the faith of Jehovah from the wisdom of the Greek philosopher. The natural force of Judaism, even in its most abject state, the elements of pure truth which it contained, the proselytizing spirit of the Jews themselves (Matt. xxiii. 15.), the diffusion of the Greek translation of the Old Testament Scriptures, the absorbing power of the Jewish Alexandrian philosophy, are sufficient to account for the hold which it acquired on the minds of men, standing, as it seemed, erect in the decline of the classical religions and the chaos of Eastern superstitions. The Roman poets in the age of Augustus were perfectly well acquainted with the belief and practices of the Jews, which extended to others as well as to their own nation; a knowledge which is the more remarkable, when contrasted with the slender information about the Christians, which is displayed by every heathen writer, for the first century and a half after the Christian era.*

Admitting the general fact of the diffusion of Judaism, no people were more likely to have fallen under its power than the inhabitants of Galatia. A half civilised race of Western origin, in an Eastern land, were peculiarly liable to be influenced by the contagion of the Jewish settlers who dwelt among them (1 Peter, i. 1.). Their

* See Introduction to Epistle to the Romans.

national religion was already mingled with the gods of the nations among whom they settled. They did not altogether cease to be heathen by becoming Jews, any more than they wholly left their ancient Gallic rites for Greek and Phrygian customs. Nor can we tell how many elements of Christianity, as, for example, the doctrine of a Messiah, may have been included in their Judaising tenets. Marked as such distinctions appear in language, there could not have been always a definite line which separated heathenism from proselytism, or proselytism from Jewish Christianity, any more than the Gospel of the circumcision from that of the uncircumcision. The more lax of either class must have insensibly faded into the other; and Judaism itself have taken new forms when coming into contact with semi-barbarous races. In the case of the Galatians we can only say, that they could not have been so completely Christians as to set aside St. Paul's claim to have converted them; nor so completely Jews as to have lost all remembrance of that former state in which they did service to them that are no gods.

Supposing then the Galatians to have passed through the gate of Judaism to Christianity, there is no longer any difficulty in explaining their relapse into Judaism. The Jewish teachers were there before St. Paul, and they remained there after his departure: and the language of the Old Testament itself, read by a different light from that in which St. Paul presented it, though sanctioned by his authority, would seem to tell of the continued obligation of the law and of the necessity of circumcision. He himself, they insidiously said, had at one time preached that very circumcision which he now denounced. They had become aware of the antagonism between themselves and him, and the instincts of Jewish party were at once directed at him.

The slenderness of our materials will not allow us to complete this picture of the Galatian Church. There is not a single figure to fill up the vacant space. We see only the inconsistency of the converts with themselves; their confusion of the Gospel with the Law; and again, of Judaism with heathenism, which latter is faintly traceable in ch. iv. 9.

GALATIA.

A BRIEF notice of the inhabitants of Galatia will throw a remote light on their connexion with the Apostle. Some have sought to identify them with the barbarous people of Lycaonia who first worshipped the Apostles and afterwards stoned them. But whatever similarity may be traced in the character of the people, Derbe and Lystra were not within the district termed Galatia (comp. Acts xvi. 1. 6.), which lay to the north, separated by Paphlagonia and Bithynia from the Euxine Sea. It was bounded on the south by Phrygia and Cappadocia, on the east by Pontus and Cappadocia, on the west by Phrygia and Bithynia, including in its domain several of the Phrygian cities most celebrated for the worship of the mother of the gods.

The inhabitants of this district were the Gauls of Asia. They were the remnant of the great Celtic and Germanic migrations, which overspread Greece and Asia Minor at the commencement of the third century before the Christian era. Like the Biscayans or Hungarians in Europe, they continued the isolated monument of the deluge which had passed away. At one time they had been the terror of the Greek cities of Asia Minor, and alternately the adversaries or the mercenaries of Alexander's successors. They were reduced by the Roman Consul, C. Manlius Vulso, in the year 189, but retained their separate kings by favour of the Romans, until about 30 years before this time, A. D. 25, when Amyntas, their last king and the favourite successively of Augustus and Antony, was murdered, and the country finally placed under a Roman governor.

In character they are described as a free impetuous race, ever ready to bear arms for themselves or others. For a long time after their settlement in Asia, they retained their national and religious customs, the latter even including that of human sacrifices. Their government in early times was a military aristocracy divided into

twelve tetrarchies, the respective chiefs of which were not hereditary, but elected. Besides the Gauls themselves who were apportioned in three tribes, two subject peoples existed side by side with them, the Greeks and Phrygians, to whom they stood in nearly the same relation as the Spartans to the Laconians and Messenians. Gradually the language and religion of the conquered made an impression on the conquerors. That they must have understood Greek is proved by the Epistle itself, though Jerome speaks of them in his own time, as still retaining a peculiar dialect which he compares to the German spoken about Trèves. Their supreme Council of three hundred corresponding to the tetrarchies of which Strabo speaks, could hardly have been of other than Greek origin. And long before this time they had adopted or added to their own religion the rites of Cybele, and participated in the worship on Mount Dindymus and the gainful occupation of selling the oracles of the goddess to the rest of Asia.

Whether the Galatian Churches were among the Gallic, or among the Greek and Phrygian tribes, we have no means of determining. The chief towns of Galatia were Ancyra the capital, Pessinus, at the foot of Mount Dindymus, and Tavium and Gaolasera on the Eastern border. From the use of the plural (*ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις*) we gather that the Churches were probably scattered throughout the district, in more than one village or town. Although it is impossible to say what the names of these Churches were, or whether the Epistle is addressed to converts who were Gauls, Phrygians, or Greeks by origin, we cannot be wrong in regarding it as addressed to a people subject to violent religious impulses, a people such as might have been celebrated for their ancient Phrygian and Bacchic rites, amongst whom in heathen days extravagant superstition most readily found a home; and who, when converted to Christianity, gave birth to Phrygian heretics and to the Montanism of the second century.

It would be hard to abstain wholly from connecting the character of the Galatians with the style and subject of the Epistle. Several circumstances suggest such a connexion:—First, the tone of the Apostle seemingly adapted to a half-barbarous people, who were to be intimidated and overpowered rather than conciliated, and were more likely to listen if he asserted than if, “becoming all things to all men,”

he withdrew his claim. Secondly, the fickleness of their conduct towards him, who first "received him as an angel of God," and then affected others who were his enemies, instead of him. Thirdly, the definite manner in which the question between Jew and Gentile is reduced to the single point of circumcision; and the positiveness with which it is insisted upon, that they should not be circumcised. There were two views which might have been maintained, and two practices certainly seem to have been adopted by the Apostle himself. "The Jewish law is indifferent, therefore let it be observed; the Jewish law is not indifferent, therefore let it not be observed." But to a rude and ignorant people it was impossible that the outward sign of Judaism could be indifferent; the badge which they bore, sealed them for the law, and not for Christ. To suppose that circumcision could have been made to them the mere symbol of circumcision of the heart, or could be understood as a mere counsel of expediency to avoid giving offence to the Jews, would be as unreasonable as to suppose that South Sea Islanders, if permitted by a missionary to retain the use of idols, would attain by means of them the knowledge of the true God.]

SUBJECT OF THE EPISTLE.

THE Epistle to the Galatians consists :—(1.) like that to the Thessalonians, of a narrative portion ; (2.) of an argument based on the Old Testament ; (3.) of practical exhortation. It would be a mistake to speak of a plan. There is no plan. The whole is a fervid and impassioned burst of remonstrance with those to whom he is writing, for having so soon fallen away from the God who called them. The Apostle is not a rhetorician, weighing the effect of his words ; he writes, because he cannot help writing ; because it is natural for him to utter, and for them to hear, the truth ; because, in his own language, he would be “straitened” if he refrained. At all events, by some means or other, he must stop this Judaism that was creeping over the Church of Galatia, which he could not but feel with indignation was strangely contrary to the lesson which he had taught them. They appeared to fancy that he was inferior to the Apostles at Jerusalem. Nothing could be less like the truth. Those who seemed to be somewhat, were, in reality, scarcely his equals ; for they added nothing to him, and were wrong when he was right. What strange infatuation had come over them ? They must begin again, and recall the feelings of their conversion. In the law itself they might read their own condemnation. For the law, too, spoke of a promise that was before the law, of the righteousness of faith, of the bond and free. He will make an appeal to them of another kind. Will they not hear his voice to whom they had once shown so intense a love ? Their old affection had passed away ; a few designing men had made a prey of them, and now they knew him no more. He had spoken too plainly to them on his last visit. What remained but that he should again warn them to preserve liberty ; to eschew licentiousness ; to remember that if a man was circumcised, he was

a debtor to keep the whole law, and that Christ would profit him nothing; and yet not to forget, if they could receive it, the higher lesson that "in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availed anything nor uncircumcision, but a new creature."

The style and subject of the Epistle to the Galatians naturally suggest a comparison with the Epistles to the Romans and to the Corinthians, with which, in date, it nearly coincides. The Epistle to the Galatians exhibits, in an earlier stage, and in a more compendious form, the same truths which are more fully expanded in the Epistle to the Romans. The differences between them may be summed up as follows:—1. The Epistle to the Galatians is personal and occasional, while that to the Romans is addressed to a church unknown to the Apostle, and has less the character of a letter, and more that of a treatise than any other of the Epistles. 2. The one treats of circumcision as a question of practice; the other of the law as a burden on the heart and conscience. 3. The argument of the Galatians is partial and fragmentary, returning often to "the weak and beggarly elements;" that of the Romans comprehensive and continuous, and, as it were, philosophical; including all mankind and all time; embodying the strife of good and evil in the heart of man, and tracing the same strife of death and life in the first and second Adam. 4. In the Epistle to the Romans several topics occur which are scarcely touched upon in the Epistle to the Galatians; such are the restoration of the Jews, the state of the heathen world, the manifestation of the sons of God. On the other hand, they have, in common, the following striking points:—The doctrine of justification by faith, as illustrated by the instance of Abraham; the universality of the Gospel of Christ, in whom is no distinction of Jew or Greek, bond or free; the nature of sin as a transgression of the law which is alluded to in Gal. ii. 18, 19., and in iii. 19.; the identity of the Christian with Christ, and of the Spirit of Christ with the soul of the Christian, as in Gal. iv. 5, 6.; the mention of the observance of days and months, Gal. iv. 10., which are treated with a difference corresponding to the difference between the two Epistles; that is to say, in the Romans as indifferent, in the Galatians as hurtful and indicative of further evil; the exhortations against Antinomianism in Rom. vi.

and Gal. v. 13.; the sonship of the Gospel contrasted with the servitude of the former dispensation, Rom. viii. 16., Gal. iv. 6.

Viewed in reference to the personal life and history of the Apostle, the Epistle to the Galatians may be considered as standing in the same relation to the Epistle to the Corinthians that it does to the Epistle to the Romans when regarded in reference to his teaching and doctrine. Here begins to show itself that difference from the other Apostles and antagonism with the Judaizers which reappears in the Epistle to the Corinthians, and which cannot be supposed to have ceased, because in the later Epistles the names of the twelve are nowhere mentioned, or because St. Paul, removed from the scene of conflict, has become rather a spectator than an actor in the troubles of the Church. Here begins that alienation from the teaching of St. Paul which in the Acts of the Apostles is foreboded by himself (xx. 29.), which was ever going on, and which, according to the latest Epistle that bears his name, was finally consummated in the cities of Asia, 2 Tim. i. 15., towards the close of his life.

But, in addition to the light which is thrown on the history by the comparison of the two Epistles, a still stronger light is shed on the character of the Apostle himself. Nowhere do we seem to see so nearly the inner man: the same in both Epistles, with just so much difference as was suited to the difference of those whom he is addressing. It has been often remarked that the Epistle to the Galatians is the only one among the Epistles of St. Paul which does not open with language of conciliation. No word of commendation escapes him. It is not "ye are enriched in all utterance and come behind in no gift;" but, "I marvel that ye are so soon fallen away from Him that called you." In the Epistles to the Corinthians he is still on terms with his opponents; he seeks to conciliate, quite as much as to awe, them; he apologises for himself; he speaks to them as to men who had not forfeited their claim to that language of Christian courtesy in which he delights to address them, and who might be made better by his good opinion of them. On the other hand, in the Galatians there is a sort of freshness in his indignation: he commences the attack at once without caring to defend himself; he knows no middle term, and keeps no measures with them. It may be

observed, further, that the matter, no less than the manner, is different. In the Galatians the Apostle confines himself to the single point of circumcision and freedom from the Jewish law (not to be made a cloak of licentiousness), in the Corinthians he never alludes to circumcision, or the Jewish law, but treats of a variety of subjects, relating partly to Church order, partly to his own defence against the charges of his opponents. The one is addressed to a civilised community, intelligent of arguments, fruitful in opinions, fertile in drawing distinctions; the other to a half-barbarous people, whom it was the Apostle's great object to protect from the external rite of circumcision.

It is to the second Epistle to the Corinthians that the Epistle to the Galatians offers the greatest resemblance. In both there is the same sensitiveness in the Apostle to the behaviour of his converts to himself, the same earnestness about the points of difference, the same remembrance of his own "infirmity" while he was yet with them, the same consciousness of the precarious basis on which his own authority rested in the existing state of the two churches. In both there is a greater display of his own feelings than in any other portion of his writings, a deeper contrast of inward exaltation and outward suffering, more of personal entreaty, a greater readiness to assert himself; all together seeming to tell us what he told the people of Derbe and Lystra, that he "was a man of like passions with ourselves," and working through the instrumentality of those passions, yet not the less approved of God in his high calling. In such passages as "Henceforth let no man trouble me, for I bear in my body the marks of the Lord Jesus," at the end of the Galatians, or in the similar feeling of the verse of the Corinthians, "I think that God hath set forth us the Apostles last appointed unto death," we trace a momentary reaction in the mind of him on whom came "the care of all the Churches."

The slight allusion in 1 Cor. xvi. 1. to the commandment which he gave respecting the collection for the saints in the churches in Galatia, shows that the Apostle did not, at this time, break off his connection with them. Had we a second Epistle to the Galatians, it might possibly have shown that the first Epistle had worked the same

“revenge” in them that the Apostle describes in the Church at Corinth (comp. 2 Tim. iv. 11.). But neither of the Galatian Church, nor of any of the Churches founded by the Apostle, do we know any more than is told us by himself and the author of the Acts. The Epistles addressed to them are like candles in a dark place, which do not illumine the intervening space which separates the beginning of the Christian Church from the daylight of history.

GENUINENESS OF THE EPISTLE.

No one has doubted the genuineness of the Epistle to the Galatians ; it is not, therefore, necessary to recapitulate at length the evidence in its favour. That evidence consists of the testimonies of Patristic as well as of heretical writers, from the time of Irenæus downwards, going back, that is, to within a century of the date of its composition. But here a doubt may be raised respecting the value of the testimonies themselves ; for it may be truly urged, that evidence as ancient, and as nearly contemporary, can be quoted in favour of the Gospel of St. James, the Shepherd of Hermas, the Revelation of Peter, and other spurious writings. Why is it, then, that a short Epistle like that to the Galatians has been universally acknowledged, even by critics of the most extreme school, as a genuine writing of St. Paul ?

The reason of this universal agreement is the internal evidence of its genuineness. Considering the number of forgeries, which we know to have existed in the second century, and the absence either of the spirit or of the faculty of criticism in the early church, we cannot set a high value on the testimony of the Fathers, except to events which were contemporary with themselves. What they really testify respecting the books of the New Testament is to their use and authority in their own day as the writings of the authors whose names they bear. But if the external testimony to the books of Scripture seems in this way to be weakened, the internal evidence of the genuineness of many of them may be regarded as greatly enhanced. What criticism has restored, though incapable of being put in a definite and tangible form, abundantly compensates for what it has destroyed. If it will not allow us to take our stand upon tradition, it supplies us with many new kinds of proof. It enables us to affirm

that a particular writing, from the richness of its style, the mannerisms of thought and language, the minuteness of the detail, the consistency, and, sometimes, the very singularity of the events recorded in it, must be an original, and not a mere imitation. It analyses the character which is proper to an individual writer, and can be in no two writers the same. And it fortunately happens, that the age least capable of affording reliable external testimony, is the age also least capable of feigning the marks of a genuine writing.

The internal evidence for the Epistle to the Galatians is of two kinds:—First, that from the manner and character of St. Paul: secondly, from the allusions to the history. No forger ever made an imitation in which were so many secret threads of similarity, which bore such a stamp of originality, or in which the character, the passion, the language, the mode of thought and reasoning, were so naturally represented. No forger, either with or without the Acts before him, would have given such an account of the relation of St. Paul to the other Apostles as we here find. There was no period in the later history of the Church in which such a state of things could naturally have been conceived. Least of all could the dispute at Antioch, so agreeable to the character of the two Apostles, yet so unlike the first thoughts of a later age respecting the earliest Christian Church, have been the invention of the second century. It is a real evidence of the genuineness of the Epistle, that Origen as well as Jerome and Chrysostom can only account for so remarkable a passage of history by resolving it into a collusion between the Apostles.

TIME AND PLACE OF THE EPISTLE.

FROM the eighth verse of the first chapter of the Galatians, we gather that the Apostle was already known by face to the church which he was addressing—"But though we or an angel from heaven preach any other gospel unto you than that we have preached unto you, let him be accursed:" from the thirteenth verse of the fourth chapter we may gather, also, that he had visited the Galatians, not only once, but twice—"Ye know how, through infirmity of the flesh, I preached the Gospel to you *at the first*," τὸ πρῶτον. This inference receives some confirmation from verses 15 and 16. of the same chapter, where he speaks, first, of the blessedness which they felt in receiving him; and then, secondly, of his having become their enemy by speaking the truth to them; a change which seems too great to have taken place during a single visit, or at least is more naturally explained by the supposition of an interval. And although we must not press impassioned expressions, such as ver. 7. of the first chapter, "I marvel that ye are *so soon* removed from Him that called you into the grace of Christ into another gospel," yet we may safely consider this passage as implying that a period of many years could not have elapsed between the first of these two visits and the writing of the Epistle.

Further, the Epistle was written after two journeys to Jerusalem, i. 18., ii. 1., and a subsequent meeting with Peter at Antioch, ii. 11. Assuming the visit mentioned in Gal. ii. 1. to be the same with that commonly called the Council in Acts xv. (see note at the end of ch. ii.), we have a point of connection with the history. Applying the Epistle to the Acts, we find that the two visits to Galatia

mentioned in the Epistle coincide with Acts xvi. 6. and xviii. 23.; the first, a visit made at the commencement of his second missionary journey; the latter, during what is sometimes called his third journey, but previously to his stay at Ephesus. Mention is also made in Acts xviii. 22. of St. Paul having been at Antioch, which may possibly have been (see notes) the occasion of his meeting with Peter in that city. Further, the words of vi. 17., "Henceforth, let no man trouble me; for I bear in my body the marks of the Lord Jesus," afford a presumption that the Apostle had been suffering recently the violence of persecution, perhaps in Ephesus (1 Cor. xv. 32.). More important than either of these possibilities is the absence of all allusion to the last journey to Jerusalem, which fixes the date of the Epistle as prior to that event.

These are all the data for determining the time at which the Epistle was written, except what are of a different kind, the internal evidences from the style and character of the Epistle itself, and the state of the church which it represents. So far as such arguments go, in the present instance, they fall in with the conclusion to which we are already tending. The situation of the Church, as it appears in the Epistle to the Galatians, is not such as we can suppose to have existed previously to the Council at Jerusalem; nor is it probable that the controversy which is described in the fifteenth chapter of the Acts as springing up at Antioch, had long before the time indicated by this mention of it spread to a remote district of Asia Minor. Still more unlikely does it appear that an Epistle, such as the Galatians, should have been written some years previously to the Epistles to the Thessalonians.

To appreciate this argument more fully, we must once more return to the comparison of the Epistle to the Galatians with some of the other Epistles of St. Paul. It is unlike the Epistles of the imprisonment; it has many points of resemblance to the Epistles to the Corinthians; it is very like, and also unlike the Epistle to the Romans. That is to say, in the latter case there is great resemblance in language and illustrations, as well as in the general subject, and yet a great difference in the mode of treating it. What is rudimentary in the one, is more fully developed in the other. The doctrine which

opens upon us in the Galatians, is in the Romans wider and more comprehensive, taking in what may be termed the difficulties and afterthoughts of the doctrine itself. In the Romans we pass from the question of circumcision or uncircumcision to that of the law or faith, from the admission of the Gentiles to the restoration of the Jews. The similarity and dissimilarity between the two Epistles are of that kind which tends to show that the Epistle to the Galatians could not have been written either after or contemporaneously with the Epistle to the Romans, and that it was not, therefore, a compendium of it; nor is it probable that it was written very long before it, considering the continuity of the subject and the sameness of the topics introduced. A similar inference may be drawn from the relation of the Epistle to the Galatians to that to the Corinthians. We trace in the former Epistle the personal antagonism in its first burst of indignation, and confined to the single point of circumcision; in the latter the same antagonism extending to many points, including a defence of the Apostle as well as a reproof of his opponents. Once more, the comparison of the Epistles of the imprisonment leads to the conclusion that the Epistle to the Galatians could not have been written at the same time with them. The calmness of the one, the fervency of the other, the contrast of style and subject, indicate that they must be referred to different periods of the Apostle's life. It would be nearer the truth to affirm that the Epistle to the Galatians stands in the same relation to the Epistle to the Romans, as the Epistle to the Colossians to the Ephesians.

All the circumstances mentioned, the two previous visits to Galatia, probably coinciding with the two mentioned in the Acts, the complaint that "they had so soon left him," the allusion to recent persecutions, the elementary form of teaching, the manner in which his opponents attacked him and he answered them, the meeting with Peter at Antioch, the omission of the last journey to Jerusalem in the second chapter, the resemblances to the Epistle to the Romans and Corinthians, together lead to the conclusion that the Epistle
= must have been written either towards the end of the Apostle's stay at Ephesus, or on the journey which succeeded it; that is,

shortly before the Epistles to the Corinthians, within a year or two of the Epistle to the Romans, and in general as early as possible consistently with allowing time for the periods and events mentioned in chaps. i. ii., and for the two previous visits to the Galatian Church.

CHAPTERS I. II.

THE main object of the first two chapters of the Epistle is to assert the independent authority of the Apostle against the attacks of the Judaizers. The few first words, "Paul, an Apostle, not of man, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ," are the text, on which every word from v. 11. of chap. i. to the end of chap. ii. is a sort of commentary. The Gospel that he preached was not human, but Divine; for he did not receive it by any human means, but by special call from God. All his antecedents, as they might be termed, were against his receiving such a call. And when he did receive it he did not go up to Jerusalem to throw himself into the arms of the Apostles, but away from it, and only after long intervals went there at all, and then saw but one or two of them, and only for a few days; so entirely were his teaching and office his own, for so little was he indebted to them. The same motive leads him, in the second chapter, to narrate the independence of his conduct at what is termed the Council of Jerusalem. He refused to yield the circumcision of Titus to the false brethren; he met the other Apostles as their equal, and gained his point against them. He resisted Peter at Antioch, and boldly reasoned with him, as building up the things which he had pulled down. These are the proofs that he was an Apostle, not of man nor by man, and had an authority at least equal to the other Apostles, to whom the Judaizers made their appeal.

ΠΡΟΣ ΓΑΛΑΤΑΣ.

ΠΡΟΣ ΓΑΛΑΤΑΣ.

ΠΑΥΛΟΣ ἀπόστολος οὐκ ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων οὐδὲ δι' ἀνθρώπου, ¹
ἀλλὰ διὰ Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ ἐγείραντος

1. The Epistle to the Galatians is the only one among St. Paul's Epistles, in which he omits all words of compliment or friendship, and begins to rebuke them strongly, almost fiercely, for their desertion of his teaching. Nothing is more common than for him to introduce his censure with words of kindness and courtesy, as if to gain a hold on the affections of those whom he is addressing. Thus, in the case of the Corinthian Church, though they had many faults, and ought rather to have mourned for the sin of the incestuous person, and their many divisions and profanation of the Lord's Supper, he begins with words of conciliation:—"I thank my God always on your behalf for the grace of God which is given you by Jesus Christ, that in every thing ye are enriched by him in all utterance and in all knowledge;" and so passes on to his censure. But in the Epistle to the Galatians he adopts a different course, either because it was more natural to his own feelings, or the actual state of the Church was worse or more likely to be roused from its Judaism by the severity of his tone.

Most of the salutations of the Epistles go beyond the language

of Christian greeting. In their simplest form, they remind us of the words of Christ, "Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you." But the Apostle, whose mind is full of the mystery of the Gospel, adds clause to clause, and parenthesis to parenthesis, until, as in the Epistles to the Romans and the Galatians, the salutation is the proem of the whole Epistle.

Παῦλος ἀπόστολος οὐκ ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων οὐδὲ δι' ἀνθρώπου, *Paul, an apostle, not of men, nor by man, but by Jesus Christ.*] As in the Romans, the Apostle begins with the emphatic assertion of his authority. The words "neither of man nor by man" are the text of the whole Epistle. The first, ἀπὸ (of), marks the source; the second, διὰ (by), the means:—"Who have an immediate call from God, and am not ordained by laying on of hands of any," like the subordinate ministers of the Apostles at Jerusalem. The antithesis of the prepositions, which is a favourite rhetorical form with St. Paul, should not be dwelt upon, however, so as to draw the mind off from the main thought, which is—"Paul, in no sense a human Apostle."

Παῦλος, *Paul.*] "Saul, who is

GALATIANS.

- ¹ PAUL, an apostle, (not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father, who raised him from

also called Paul;” Acts, xiii. 9. No certain conclusion can be arrived at respecting the origin of the second name, which may, perhaps, need no other explanation than that St. Paul was a Roman citizen as well as a “Hebrew of the Hebrews.” There is no reason to suppose, that it was assumed by him after his conversion. Still more fanciful is it, to connect his use of the name with Sergius Paulus. He is called Saul in the earlier portion of the Acts, while among Jews: the name Paul is first given him at the commencement of his more extended mission to the heathen. That he bore a Gentile name, which he uses in all his Epistles, could not have been without significance to himself.

ἀπόστολος, an apostle.] What was the nature of the Apostolical office, and in what sense was St. Paul an Apostle? In endeavouring to answer this question, which has been already touched upon, on 1 Thessalonians, we must distinguish the application of the term to St. Paul from its application to the Twelve, as well as from that wider sense in which it was occasionally used of other preachers of the Gospel, 2 Cor. viii. 23.; Phil. ii. 25. The

Twelve were the appointed witnesses of Christ, “who had been with him during all the time that he went in and out among his disciples.” (Acts, i. 21, 22.) Some of them appear also to have been the “pillars” of the Church at Jerusalem, Gal. ii. 9., and to have preached in distant countries, in accordance with His word. They are recognised by St. Paul as a separate body, in 1 Cor. xv. 5.; and are mentioned as “the Twelve” in Rev. xxi. 14. Their number may possibly have had a relation to the number of the tribes; Luke, xxii. 30. More than this we cannot say. Whatever tradition may have added to their history, or modern association appended to their name, must not withdraw us from the main idea of the Apostolical office, which was that of an immediate and personal relation to Christ in the first teachers of the Gospel.

That in this stricter sense the term is not applicable to St. Paul, is obvious. It might be said of him in his own words, that he was an Apostle, “not in the letter but in the spirit.” To the Judaizers any addition to the Twelve would have been a violation of the sacred number appointed by Christ himself. The Apostle urges other claims to the title,

αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν, καὶ οἱ σὺν ἐμοὶ πάντες ἀδελφοί, ταῖς 2
ἐκκλησίαις τῆς Γαλατίας. χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ 3
πατρὸς καὶ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, τοῦ δόντος ἑαυτὸν 4

1 Cor. ix. 1. 2.:—“Am I not an apostle? am I not free? have I not seen Jesus Christ our Lord? are not ye my word in the Lord? If I be not an apostle unto others, yet doubtless I am to you: for the seal of mine apostleship are ye in the Lord.” All the language that St. Paul uses on this subject shows, first, that he did place himself on a level with the Twelve; secondly, that his call to the Apostleship did not, in his own mind, rest on some one definite act, such as is spoken of in Acts, xiii. 2. 3., but partly on the revelation to him, at his conversion; partly on the fact of his having, like the other Apostles, seen the Lord; partly on the success of his labours, as well as on his own inward intense conviction that this was the work which he was appointed to do. It is remarkable that the necessity which he felt, for the sake of truth to establish his authority on an independent basis, does not prevent the acknowledgment in this passage, ver. 13., or the still more striking one in 1. Cor. xv. 9.:—“For I am the least of the apostles, that am not meet to be called an apostle, because I persecuted the church of God.”

οὐδὲ δι' ἀνθρώπου, *nor by man.*] The change from the plural to the singular seems to arise from the juxtaposition of διὰ Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ not of men, nor by man, but by Jesus Christ. δι' ἀνθρώπου is abstract, not concrete, the singular supplying the link of opposi-

tion to διὰ Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ. Comp. 1 Cor. xv. 21. The preposition διὰ (by) is not applicable in the same sense to all the three words ἀνθρώπου, χριστοῦ, Θεοῦ, which is another reason for not pressing the antithesis of ἀπὸ and διὰ. διὰ is applied to God, either by attraction from χριστοῦ, or in connexion with the particular act of raising up Christ, or as He is the beginning and end of all things, including in Himself the means. Romans, xi. 36. Compare iv. 7., Lachm. Chrysostom supposes that, having applied the word διὰ to Christ, the Apostle applies it also to the Father, lest it should occur to any to degrade the Son to the rank of a subordinate minister. This is the mind, not of the Apostolic, but of the Nicene age.

Θεοῦ πατρός, *God the Father.*] Of whom is God said to be the father? of Christ or of mankind? It may be answered that in the Old Testament God is the Father of the Jewish people; in the New Testament, of Christ, and through Him of mankind. Yet the word itself does not necessarily involve these associations. It may express the feeling “by which we say, Abba Father,” without awakening the thought of “sons or children.” From being relative, it becomes absolute. Only in some passages, as here, its original idea is recalled by the mention of the Lord Jesus Christ.

τοῦ ἐγείναντος αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν, *who raised him from the dead.*] St. Paul does not use these words

2 the dead;) and all the brethren which are with me, unto
 3 the churches of Galatia; grace be to you and peace from
 4 God the Father, and from our Lord Jesus Christ, who

simply as narrating an external fact; they express rather what has become the attribute of God. God cannot be thought of by the believer, but as God in Christ, the God who revealed himself in the Gospel; nor Christ, but as the risen Lord in whom we also rise again. As we might say,—“God who gave his only begotten Son.” St. Paul extends the same form of language to the separate parts of our Lord’s life:—“God who raised up Christ,” &c.

2. οἱ σὺν ἐμοὶ πάντες ἀδελφοί, *all the brethren which are with me.*] It is doubted whether St. Paul is here speaking: (1.) only of two or three of his companions, who accompanied him in his journey; or, (2.) of his fellow labourers in general; or, (3.) of the whole Church. The first seems too small a number for the word πάντες (all); while the second does not appear justified by the passages which are cited in support of it, viz. 1 Cor. i. 1.; 2 Cor. i. 1.; Phil. iv. 24. A more general interpretation is preferable. The words themselves are vague and undefined. It is as if in a private letter we were to say “All here unite with me,” &c., that is to say, not the servants of the household, nor friends in the neighbourhood, but all whom according to the usual forms of speech it would occur to our correspondent to include in these words.

ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς Γαλατίας, *the Churches in Galatia,*] mentioned in the Acts, xvi. 6., xviii. 23., on the occasion of St. Paul’s two

visits to them; and in 1 Cor. xvi. 1., as making a collection for the Church at Jerusalem, and in 1 Peter, i. 1. as having among them “strangers of the dispersion.”

3. χάρις ὑμῖν.] See 1 Thess. i. 1.

4. τοῦ δόντος ἑαυτὸν περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν, *who gave himself for our sins.*] περὶ, and not ὑπέρ, is the true reading. It may be compared, in this passage, with περὶ ἁμαρτίας, in Romans, viii. 3., the same expression being also used in the same sense by the LXX. for a sin offering, Lev. vi. 3., Ps. xxxix. 6.

When it is said that Christ gave himself for our sins, or as a sin offering, the shadow must not be put in the place of the substance, or the Jewish image substituted for the truth of the Gospel. On such language it may be remarked:—(1.) that it is figurative, natural, and intelligible to that age, not equally so to us; (2.) that the figures themselves which describe the work of Christ are varied, thereby showing that they are figures only, and not realities or matters of fact; (3.) that the same sacrificial language is applied almost equally to the believer and to his Lord; (4.) that the effect and meaning of this language must have been very different while the sacrifices were being daily offered, and now that they have passed away; (5.) that expressions such as that which we are considering seldom occur in the writings of St. Paul, another class of figures, in which the believer is identified with the

περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν, ὅπως ἐξέλγεται ἡμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ² αἰῶνος τοῦ ἐνεστώτος πονηροῦ κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἡμῶν, ᾧ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων, ἀμήν. 5

Θαυμάζω ὅτι οὕτως ταχέως μετατίθεσθε ἀπὸ τοῦ κα- 6
λέσαντος ὑμᾶς ἐν χάριτι χριστοῦ εἰς ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον,

¹ ὑπέρ.

² ἐνεσ. αἰῶ. πονηροῦ.

various stages of the life of Christ, being far more common; (6.) that, in general, the thing meant by them is that Christ took upon Him human flesh, that he was put to death by sinful men, and raised men out of the state of sin, in this sense taking their sins upon himself.

ὅπως ἐξέλγεται ἡμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦ ἐνεστώτος πονηροῦ, *that he may take us out of this evil world present.*] These words contain an allusion to the Jewish distinction of αἰὼν ἐνεστώς, or αἰὼν οὗτος, and the αἰὼν μέλλων, the times before and after the inauguration of Messiah's kingdom. But their meaning may be said to vary as the thing signified by them assumes to the believer a more inward and spiritual nature, is more past or present. The αἰὼν ἐνεστώς is the world around him, from which the Christian withdraws into communion with God, from which he shall be delivered finally in the world of glory. It is called evil, partly for the same reason that St. Paul says in the Romans that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth together until now, partly as it is the scene of the believer's trials and persecutions, partly because the burden of the flesh is inseparable from this present state.

To this present evil world, which is subject to the prince of

the power of the air (Eph. ii. 2.), is opposed the future world, of which Christ is the Lord. The one is the creation made subject to bondage, "full of principalities and powers, and spiritual wickedness in heavenly places;" the other is the glorious liberty of the children of God. A trace of the same thought occurs in the word ἐνεστώσα in 1 Corinth. vii. ch. 6:—διὰ τὴν ἐνεστώσαν ἀνάγκην, "on account of this present necessity." The mind of the Apostle is overpowered by the contrast of faith and sight; the bondage and constraint of the world, which might well make a man go out of the world, and the hope of salvation, to which men in general are so blind. There is a tone of suffering and sadness in the view of redemption expressed in these words: it is the feeling of the close of the Epistle:—"I bear in my body the marks of the Lord Jesus."

The word αἰὼν passes through the same changes of meaning in the New Testament as the Latin word "sæculum." First it is used for continuance of time,—"Thou shalt not wash my feet εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα," for ever; or with more emphasis, as in John, vi. 51. ; ζήσεται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, "shall live for ever;" or still more strongly of the existence of God, or the happiness of the blessed, in the plural, as in the Revelation. In the writers

gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from this present evil world, according to the will of God and
 5 our Father : to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen.
 6 I marvel that ye are so soon removed from Him that called you in * the grace of Christ unto another gospel :

of the New Testament, as in the Jewish writers, ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος, Romans xii. 2., ἐνεστώς, as in this place, ὁ νῦν, as in 1 Tim. vi. 17., are opposed to ὁ αἰὼν ἐκεῖνός, Luke xx. 34., ὁ μέλλον, Matth. xii. 32., ἐρχόμενος, Luke xviii. 20., as present and future, as evil and good.

The idea of ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος is illustrated by Eph. ii. 2:—"And you (hath he quickened), being dead in trespasses and sins, wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience,"—which not only gives the associations implied in ὁ αἰὼν τοῦ κόσμου τούτου, but assists in explaining the transition of meaning by which αἰὼν comes to signify the world without the idea of time ; as in Heb. xi. 3., "The worlds are framed by the word of God ;" or in 1 Corinth. i. 20. "The disputer of the world." Comp. also our uses of "the world," which are nearly analogous, for the heavens and earth and all things in them, for this present state, as opposed to the life to come ; and also, in a bad sense, for the world, whether within or without man, as opposed to the kingdom of God.

κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἡμῶν, according to the will of God and our Father.] God is the original source of the work

of redemption ; yet for a time it is viewed also as carried on apart from Him on earth, not διὰ, but κατὰ.

5. ᾧ ἡ δόξα,] to whom be ascribed the glory that belongs to Him.

6. οὕτως ταχέως, so soon,] i. e. after their conversion. Quickly and slowly are relative terms. The only inference that can be drawn from these words is that the epistle could not have been written several years after the Apostle's visits recorded in the Acts.

μετατίθεσθε ἀπὸ τοῦ καλέσαντος ὑμᾶς, transferred from Him that called you.] ὁ καλέσας does not refer to St. Paul, the human instrument, but to God Himself. Compare ver. 15., Rom. viii. 30. The allegiance from which they had departed was not to the Apostle, but to God.

ἐν χάριτι χριστοῦ, in the grace of Christ.] Interpreters doubt whether ἐν is here instrumental, or put for εἰς, or a confusion of ἐν and εἰς. It is better to regard the whole expression as an amplification or variation of ἐν χριστῷ. Comp. 1 Cor. vii. 15:—ἐν δὲ εἰρήνῃ κέκληκεν ἡμᾶς ὁ Θεός.

Prepositions, when applied to place, have a fixed and definite meaning, or rather are the fixed and definite symbols of the meaning of the case which they precede. When transferred to the notion of cause, effect, manner, instrument, &c., they become am-

ὁ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλο, εἰ μὴ τινές εἰσιν οἱ ταρασσοντες ὑμᾶς 7
καὶ θέλοντες μεταστρέψαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ χριστοῦ. ἀλλὰ 8
καὶ ἐὰν ἡμεῖς ἡ ἄγγελος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ εὐαγγελίζηται ὑμῖν
παρ' ὃ εὐηγγελισάμεθα ὑμῖν, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω. ὡς προειρη- 9
καμεν καὶ ἄρτι πάλιν λέγω, εἴ τις ὑμᾶς εὐαγγελίζεται παρ'
ὃ παρελάβετε, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω. ἄρτι γὰρ ἀνθρώπους πείθω, 10

biguous, and still more so when used to denote divine and spiritual relations. Hence, in the decline of the Greek language, and especially in the New Testament, they are often transposed, frequently placed in false antithesis, or occur *παρά προσδοκίαν*, as in the present passage. Compare 1 Thess. iv. 7

εἰς ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον, to another Gospel.] The nature of this other Gospel we may in some measure infer from the indications of the Epistle. First, it was a Gospel which was supposed to rest on the authority of the other Apostles rather than of St. Paul, as we gather from the tone of the first two chapters; secondly, it was a Gospel of the Circumcision, which required all the converts to conform to the law of Moses, and observe the times appointed by it, as we learn from chap. iv. 10. The name of Christ was doubtless retained in it, or it would not have been a Gospel at all. It would be too much to infer, from chap. v. 15. 26., that it was a Gospel of licentiousness, as it is uncertain whether the Apostle is there addressing his own followers or his opponents, or both indifferently.

7. ὁ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλο, *which is not another.*] Either which turning aside is nothing else but certain troublemakers seeking to pervert the Gospel of Christ; or which Gos-

pel is not another (for there cannot be two Gospels), but only certain troublemakers of the Church.

The last is the more probable explanation. It seems to have arisen, however, from a confusion of the former. What the Apostle meant to say was "which change of mind, or which Gospel, is nothing else than the work of certain troublemakers:" ὁ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλο ἢ τινες οἱ ταρασσοντες ὑμᾶς. But the similarity of meaning in ἄλλο and ἕτερον caught his mind in the act of framing the sentence, and led him to give a new sense to ἄλλο, which occasioned the further alteration of ἡ into εἰ μὴ. An additional confusion has arisen from the uncertainty whether ὁ is to be referred to ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον, or to εὐαγγέλιον only. Comp. for a similar variation, without difference of meaning, in ἄλλο and ἕτερον, 2 Cor. xi. 4:—εἰ μὲν γὰρ ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἄλλον Ἰησοῦν κηρύσσει ὃν οὐκ ἐκηρύξαμεν, ἢ πνεῦμα ἕτερον λαμβάνετε ὁ οὐκ ἐλάβετε, ἢ εὐαγγέλιον ἕτερον ὁ οὐκ ἐδέξασθε, καλῶς ἀνέχεσθε; also, as showing the same kind of acknowledgment that there was a Gospel contained even in the preaching of his opponents, Philip. i. 15:—"Some indeed preach Christ even of envy and strife; and some also of good will: the one preach Christ of contention, not sincerely, supposing to add affliction to my

7 which is not another ; but there be some that trouble
 8 you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ. But
 though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other
 gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto
 9 you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say I
 now again, If any man preach any other gospel unto you
 10 than ye have received, let him be accursed. For do I

bonds ; what then, notwithstanding, whether in pretence or in truth, Christ is preached ;” also for the play of words, Gal. iii. 20. :—ὁ δὲ μεσίτης ἐνός οὐκ ἔστιν, ὁ δὲ θεός εἷς ἐστίν ; for the correction :—εἰ γε καὶ εἰκῇ, iii. 4. ; and for εἰ μή, 1 Cor. vii. 17.

8. ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰ ἂν ἡμεῖς, *but even if we.*] ἡμεῖς = St. Paul. The meaning may be paraphrased thus :—“But though I myself, not to speak of your false teachers, or an angel from heaven, preach another Gospel, let him be accursed.” Comp. 1 Cor. xiii. 1. :—“Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels ; also, 2 Thess. ii. 2. :—“That ye be not soon troubled in mind, neither by Spirit, nor by word, nor by letter, as by us.” Schœttgen gives the following parallel from a Rabbinical comment on Deut. xxx. 12.,—the law is not in heaven : “Quid sibi volent hæc verba ? Respondit R. Jeremias : Quum jam lex nobis de monte Sinai data sit non expectamus bath kol.”

ἀνάθεμα ἔστω, *let him be accursed.*] Compare 1 Cor. xvi. 22. :—“If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be anathema ;” and Gal. v. 10. :—“He that troubleth you shall bear his judgement.”

9. ὥς προειρήκαμεν.] “I have said it before, and I say it again, let him be accursed.” St. Paul may be referring either to the anathema in the preceding verse, as in 1 Cor. v. 9. he refers to his own words immediately preceding :—“I wrote unto you in the Epistle.” Comp. Eph. iii. 3. Or he may allude to his own visit to them, probably the second of the two occasions mentioned in Gal. iv. 15., 16.

10. ἄρτι γὰρ ἀνθρώπους πείθω, ἢ τὸν θεόν ; *for do I now persuade men, or God ?*] Comp. Matt. xxviii. 14., Acts, xiv. 19., for the use of πείθω, which applies properly to men, but improperly to God ; or, in other words, requires a change of meaning before it can be used in the latter connexion. It is here nearly equivalent to ζητῶ ἀρέσκειν, which follows, and may be translated so as to preserve the double meaning :—“For do I now seek to approve myself to man or to God ?”

The strong language which the Apostle had just used might seem to need a justification. But the very use of it was an answer to a charge which the Judaizers brought against him,—that of want of sincerity.

A parallel instance of conduct

ἢ τὸν θεόν; ἢ ζητῶ ἀνθρώποις ἀρέσκειν; εἰ ¹ ἐτι ἀνθρώποις ἤρεσκον, χριστοῦ δούλος οὐκ ἂν ἦμην.

Γνωρίζω δὲ ὑμῖν, ἀδελφοί, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τὸ εὐαγγελισθὲν ¹¹
ὑπ' ἐμοῦ, ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν κατὰ ἄνθρωπον· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐγὼ ¹²
παρὰ ἀνθρώπου παρελαβὼν αὐτὸ οὐδὲ ἐδιδάχθην, ἀλλὰ δι'
ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ. ἡκούσατε γὰρ τὴν ἐμὴν ¹³

¹ Add γὰρ.

among ourselves may serve as an illustration. A person is accused of flattery, smoothness, &c.; something has led him to form an unfavourable judgement of another. Presently he thunders out the truth about them, adding the comment, "why, I would not be charged with want of sincerity this time." According to this mode of taking the passage, ἄρτι refers to the previous verse, perhaps arising out of the sound of the previous ἄρτι, but not connected with it in sense; γὰρ to the suppressed reason in the Apostle's mind. Comp., for the feeling expressed, 1 Cor. iv. 1—7.; also 2 Cor. v. 11.

εἰ ἐτι ἀνθρώποις ἤρεσκον, *if I yet pleased men.*] Not that there had been a time when he was a pleaser of men, but, in a general sense, "If, after all that has happened to me, I am, or were still, a pleaser of men, I could not be the servant of God. Comp. Matt. vi. 24. :—"No man can serve two masters."

The Apostle now resumes the thread with which he commenced. He was an Apostle, not of man, nor by man; and now he goes on to add, the Gospel which he preached was not derived from the Apostles at Jerusalem, but from the revelation of Christ himself.

11. Γνωρίζω δὲ ὑμῖν,] Now I give you to know, I draw your attention to the fact, is a favourite formula of the Apostle, occurring 1 Cor. xii. 3. xv. 1., 2 Cor. viii. 1., similar in meaning to the words with which he commences 1 Cor. xii. 1.:—οὐ θέλω ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν.

κατὰ ἄνθρωπον, *human.*] A periphrasis for ἀνθρώπινον. With this is joined παρὰ ἀνθρώπου in the following verse.

12. For I did not receive it, and was not instructed in it by man, but Christ revealed it to me. It could not, therefore, be human. Comp. Eph. iii. 3.:—"How that by revelation he made known unto me the mystery; as I wrote before in few words."

Whether the occasion here alluded to is Acts, ix. 6., or Acts, xxii. 17., the first conversion of the Apostle, or the after trance in the temple mentioned by him in his speech to the Jews, or the occasion alluded to in the 2 Corinthians, xii. 4., when he was caught up into Paradise and heard unspeakable things, or some other occasion, is uncertain. He implies in the last-mentioned quotation that he had many revelations. Comp. Gal. ii. 2.

The full explanation of the word ἀποκάλυψις, revelation, is beyond the limits of a note. It is

now persuade men, or God ? or do I seek to please men ? if I yet pleased men, I should not be the servant of Christ.

- 11 But I certify you, brethren, that the gospel which was
12 preached of me is not after man. For I neither received
it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation
13 of Jesus Christ. For ye have heard of my conversation

¹ Add for.

applied, first, to the manifestation of the Gospel, as hidden in the bosom of eternity, Rom. xvi. 25. — *κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν μυστηρίου χρόνοις αἰωνίοις σεσιγημένου*; also to the day of judgment, Rom. ii. 5:— *ἡμέρα ὁργῆς καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως*; also to the expected coming of Christ in such expressions as “Revelation of the Lord,” 1 Cor. i. 7.; “Revelation of the sons of God,” Rom. viii. 19.; also to the Book so termed; also to the gifts of individuals, one of which is termed the gift of revelation. In this sense it is placed side by side with visions in 2 Cor. xii. 1.:—“I will come to visions and revelations of the Lord.” A spirit of wisdom and revelation is spoken of in Ephes. i. 17. In 2 Cor. ii. 7. St. Paul alludes to the abundance of his revelations; and lastly, in Gal. ii. 2., he receives a particular intimation that he should go up to Jerusalem by revelation.

Revelation is distinguished from ordinary moral and spiritual influences by its suddenness. It shows us in an instant, what, under ordinary circumstances would grow up gradually and insensibly. In the individual it is accompanied by a sudden transition from darkness to light; in the world at large it is an anticipation of moral truth and of the

course of human experience. Reducible to no natural laws, it is to our ordinary moral and spiritual nature what peculiar cataleptic conditions are to our bodily constitution. It seems to come from without, and is not to be confounded with any inward emotion, any more than a dream or the sight of a painting. As compared with prophecy, it is nearer to us, representing as in a picture the things that shall shortly come to pass, and yet embracing a wider range; not, like the prophets of old, describing the fortunes of an individual nation, as it may have crossed the path of the Jewish people, but lifting up the veil from the whole invisible world.

In all its different senses it retains this external, present, immediate character. Whether it be the future kingdom of Christ, or the fall of Jerusalem or of Rome, or the world lying in wickedness, that is described, all is displayed immediately before us as on some mount of transfiguration—the figures near to us, and the colours bright.

13. As we might say: For you, who know my former life, may well believe that it was by nothing short of a miracle I was converted. I will tell you the whole tale, and you will see how unlikely

ἀναστροφὴν ποτε ἐν τῷ Ἰουδαϊσμῷ, ὅτι καθ' ὑπερβολὴν
 ἐδίωκον τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἐπόρθουν αὐτήν, καὶ 14
 προέκοπτον ἐν τῷ Ἰουδαϊσμῷ ὑπὲρ πολλοὺς συνηλικιώτας
 ἐν τῷ γένει μου, περισσοτέρως ζηλωτῆς ὑπάρχων τῶν
 πατρικῶν μου παραδόσεων. ὅτε δὲ εὐδόκησεν [ὁ θεὸς] ὁ 15
 ἀφορίσας με ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου καὶ καλέσας διὰ τῆς
 χάριτος αὐτοῦ ἀποκαλύψαι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐμοί, ἵνα 16
 εὐαγγελίζωμαι αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, εὐθέως οὐ προσα-

I was to have received the Gospel from the word of others.

τοῦ Θεοῦ seems to be added here, as in 1 Cor. xv. 9., to exaggerate his offence.

Ver. 14. has the same object as the preceding:—"And I was, too, a learned Pharisee, distinguished above my equals, and more than ordinarily zealous for the traditions of the Fathers." ἐν τῷ Ἰουδαϊσμῷ, as in the previous verse, not Jewish theology, but more generally the Jewish religion. ἐν τῷ γένει μου, "of my nation."

τῶν πατρικῶν μου παραδόσεων.] The traditions of the Pharisees, not excluding the law, generally; all that it was proper for a Jew to believe. Comp. the words of Christ:—"Ye make the word of God of none effect by your tradition."

15. ὅτε δὲ εὐδόκησεν, *but when it pleased God.*] Was the substance of this revelation to St. Paul the image of Christ crucified, or the particular events of His life, or the words which He used in discoursing with His disciples? Our only grounds for answering this question must be derived from the Epistles of St. Paul, which make no reference to any events narrated in the Gospel, with the exception of His death and resurrection, and the com-

memoration of Him in the Lord's Supper, until His coming again, and which in two instances at most,—1 Cor. vii. 10., 1 Thess. iv. 15.,—if at all, appeal to words used by Him. Comp. also Acts, xx. 35.

What was revealed to St. Paul must have been what he preached: Christ, the Messiah of the Jews,—the Son of God, in whom all are one,—who died "and rose again for the sins of men,—who shall come in the day of the Lord." We have no reason to think that the body of historical facts was supernaturally imparted to him. When the historical truth of the Gospel is what he dwells upon, he appeals to external witnesses; 1 Cor. xv. 1—7. The only apparent exception to this view is 1 Cor. xi. 23., which need not be so interpreted as to be inconsistent with the general tenour of the Epistles. (Comp. the use of the word *παρέλαβον* in 1 Cor. xv. 3.)

In accordance with these data, we must reply, that the revelation of Christ to St. Paul was doctrinal and spiritual, rather than historical,—a revelation of Christ in him, as the expression in this passage implies,—not external information brought to him. It was the ever-growing

- in time past in the Jews' religion, how that beyond measure I persecuted the church of God, and wasted it:
 14 and profited in the Jews' religion above many my equals in mine own nation, being more exceedingly
 15 zealous of the traditions of my fathers. But when it pleased God, who separated me from my mother's womb,
 16 and called me by his grace, to reveal his Son in me, that I might preach him among the heathen; immediately

sense of union with Christ, imparted not in one revelation but many, not only by special revelation, but as the inward experience of a long life, for which his union in Christ with all mankind and his mission to preach the Gospel to the Gentiles were from the beginning inseparable; as a part of which the image of the meekness and gentleness of Christ formed itself in him, not without the remembrance that he had "seen" Him who was now passed into the heavens.

The germ and new birth of this are what he describes in the expression, ἀποκαλύψαι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐμοί.

ἀφορίσας.] Here ἀφορίσας has a double meaning: first, a literal and physical one; secondly, that of which this is the figure,—a spiritual one:—"Who took me out of my mother's womb, and separated me; or whose separation of me at my birth was the image of my separation unto himself." The allusion so natural to us, would be yet more natural to one so well acquainted with the LXX. as St. Paul.

ἀφορίσας, in thought rather than time, precedes καλέσας, as the intention the act. A third aspect of the act is given by

ἀποκαλύψαι, as it became present and conscious to the Apostle himself. The care of God for him began with his birth, but this natural providence was the earnest of what was to follow.

16. ἀποκαλύψαι τὸν υἱόν.] Comp. the expression used respecting the Galatians:—"Before whose eyes Jesus Christ was openly set forth (προεγράφη) crucified."

ἐν ἐμοί,] in my inmost soul, not simply for ἐμοί. Comp. ὃ λατρεύω ἐν τῷ πνεύματί μου. It was a revelation that dwelt in, and became one with, the Apostle's thoughts.

ἵνα εὐαγγελίζωμαι.] Comp. Acts, xxii. 17—22:—"Depart, for I will send thee far hence unto the Gentiles."

εὐθέως.] I straightway went away, taking no counsel with flesh and blood. εὐθέως is really connected with ἀπῆλθον; but the Apostle, whose thoughts outrun his words, has interposed the negative clause, to anticipate his purpose in going away.

προσανέμην,] I did not go to advise with. Comp. Diodorus Siculus, xvii. 116:—τοῖς μάντεσι προσαναθέμενος περὶ τοῦ σημείου. Luc. Jup. Trag. § 1:—ἐμοί προσανάθου; λάξε με σύμβουλον πύγων.

νεθέμην σαρκὶ καὶ αἵματι, οὐδὲ ἀπῆλθον¹ εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα 17
 πρὸς τοὺς πρὸ ἐμοῦ ἀποστόλους, ἀλλὰ ἀπῆλθον εἰς Ἀρα-
 βίαν, καὶ πάλιν ὑπέστρεψα εἰς Δαμασκόν. ἔπειτα μετὰ 18
 ἔτη τρία ἀνῆλθον εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα ἱστορῆσαι Κηφᾶν², καὶ
 ἐπέμεινα πρὸς αὐτὸν ἡμέρας δεκαπέντε· ἕτερον δὲ τῶν 19
 ἀποστόλων οὐκ εἶδον, εἰ μὴ Ἰάκωβον τὸν ἀδελφὸν τοῦ κυ-

¹ ἀνῆλθον.² Πέτρον.

σάρκι καὶ αἵματι,] with weak men.

17. οὐδὲ expresses not a new possible alternative, but a particular case of the preceding.

πρὸς τοὺς πρὸ ἐμοῦ ἀποστόλους.] Comp. 1 Cor. xv. 8.:—"Last of all he was seen of us also;" also Romans, xvi. 7.:—"Distinguished among the Apostles who were before me in the Lord."

εἰς Ἀραβίαν,] *i. e.* in the opposite direction to Jerusalem.

18. ἔπειτα μετὰ ἔτη τρία, *then after three years.*] The same question arises here as in the first verse of the next chapter, "Whether the three years are to be reckoned for the conversion of the Apostle, or for the return to Damascus." The first seems indicated by the words of the preceding verse:—"Neither went I up to Jerusalem." "I did not go up to Jerusalem then, but three years afterwards I did." It is not said, as is often stated, that the Apostle passed three years in Arabia. There may have been an interval of three years between his return to Damascus and his journey to Jerusalem, according to the interpretation which we reject; or the period of three years may have included a sojourn in Arabia and a stay at Damascus, according to the interpretation preferred above. But,

whichever way we take the passage, there is no reason to suppose that the three years were passed solely in Arabia. μετὰ ἔτη τρία is opposed to εὐθέως in the preceding verse.

ἱστορῆσαι Κηφᾶν,] to make acquaintance with Peter. Comp. Joseph. Bell. vi. 1. 8.:—"οὐκ ἄσχυρος ὢν ἀνὴρ ὃν ἐγὼ κατ' ἐκείνον ἱστέω τὸν πόλεμον, ἐπέμεινα πρὸς αὐτόν," "I remained with him," πρὸς used according to the common confusion in Greek of rest and motion. Comp. ii. 5. διαμείνῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς.

ἡμέρας δεκαπέντε.] The object of these words has been already noticed. "At first I did not go to Jerusalem; then, after some years I did, but stayed only a few days, and saw scarcely anybody."

One of the commentators remarks that fifteen days was a long time, quite sufficient for the Apostle to receive the commands of the Church at Jerusalem. He therefore supposes that St. Paul's opponents had falsely averred of him that he had been the disciple of the other Apostles. The general impression of the passage is the best answer to such criticism. If we suppose a person to say to us, of another, "I knew such a one fifteen years ago, and staid with him a fortnight," we certainly should not presume

- 17 I conferred not with flesh and blood: neither went I
¹ to Jerusalem to them which were apostles before me; but
 I went into Arabia, and returned again unto Damascus.
 18 Then after three years I went up to Jerusalem to see
 19 Cephas², and abode with him fifteen days. But other
 of the apostles saw I none, save James the Lord's

¹ Add up.

² Peter.

any great degree of acquaintance.

19. Ἰάκωβον τὸν ἀδελφὸν τοῦ κυρίου.] Two lines of argument have been taken in reference to these words: First, they are said to show, by the very form of the sentence, that the brother of the Lord must have been the Apostle: "But other of the Apostles saw I none, save James" (comp. 1 Cor. i. 14.), who, if the expression is taken strictly, must therefore be included in the number of the Apostles. A comparison of Revelation xxi. 27., Gal. ii. 16., and other passages, leads us to infer that εἰ μὴ may be used in the sense not of "save or except" only, but simply for "but." An ingenious argument has also been used on the opposite side of the question, to prove that James, the brother of our Lord, was not either the Apostle or the Bishop of that name, but a comparatively unimportant person. The context, it is said, requires the meaning, I only saw Peter and one other unimportant person; and that the drift of the passage is lost, if we suppose the Apostle to say, "of the three great heads of the Church, I only saw two." This argument is too finely spun; it is sufficiently answered by observing that James "the brother of the Lord" could never have been an obscure person. It confuses

the general drift of the passage with its details. In general the Apostle expresses his own impression, which was, in familiar language, that his visit could scarcely be termed a visit; but in the details he states the actual fact of whom he saw, without reference to the particular effect of the statement.

Stronger grounds may, however, be urged to show that James the brother of our Lord is the same with James the son of Alphaeus the Apostle; not including in them 1 Cor. xv. 7:—"He was seen of James, then of all the Apostles," which is remarkable as being equally ambiguous with our present passage. The arguments on this side of the question may be summed up as follows:—

1. The name of James the less implying that there were only two and not three of that name.

2. The result of the comparison of the three following passages:—

Mark, xv. 40. :—"There were also women looking on afar off; among whom was Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James the less and of Joses, and Salome."

John, xix. 25. :—"There stood by the cross of Jesus His mother, and His mother's sister, Mary

ρίου. ἃ δὲ γράφω ὑμῖν, ἰδοὺ ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ, ὅτι οὐ ψεύ- 20
δομαι. ἔπειτα ἦλθον εἰς τὰ κλίματα τῆς Συρίας καὶ τῆς 21
Κιλικίας. ἤμην δὲ ἀγνοούμενος τῷ προσώπῳ ταῖς ἐκ- 22
κλησίαις τῆς Ἰουδαίας ταῖς ἐν χριστῷ, μόνον δὲ ἀκούον- 23
τες ἦσαν ὅτι ὁ διώκων ἡμᾶς ποτὲ νῦν εὐαγγελίζεται τὴν
πίστιν ἣν ποτε ἐπόρθει, καὶ ἐδόξαζον ἐν ἐμοὶ τὸν θεόν. 24

the wife of Cleophas, and Mary Magdalene."

Mark, vi. 3. :—"Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary, the brother of James, and Joses, and of Juda, and Simon? and are not His sisters here with us?" Comp. Matt. xiii. 55. [Joseph. Lachm.]

Here, Mary the mother of James and Joses is identified with Mary the wife of Cleophas; and this identification of the two Marys is confirmed by the third passage, which speaks of her sons as the brethren of Jesus.

Lastly, the name Alpheus is the same as Cleophas; being in the Aramaic ܐܠܦܗ, and the two forms arising only out of the different pronunciations of the ܐ.

One further possibility must be admitted. Mary the mother of James the less, and Joses, and Salome, may be the same with Mary the wife of Cleophas; and yet James "the brother of the Lord" not the same with James the less, who was her son, but the son of the Virgin Mary and of Joseph. In favour of this supposition may be urged :—

(1.) The words of Mark, vi. 3., which expressly refer to "the carpenter" and Mary the mother of Christ, and can hardly allude to the sons of another Mary in the same verse.

(2.) The emphatic use of the

term "brother of the Lord."

Comp. Josephus, Ant. xx. 9. 1. To be the cousin of Christ, even if it were a natural explanation of the word, could hardly have been a claim to extraordinary respect in the early Church.

(3.) The obvious meaning of Matt. i. 25. :—"And knew her not until she had brought forth her firstborn Son," which has been smothered by the feelings of a later generation.

On the other hand, the comparison of Mark, vi. 3. and xv. 40., suggests the improbability of Mary the wife of Cleophas and Mary the mother of Christ each having two sons the same in name, James and Joses; the force of which is, however, in a great measure, done away by the reading of Lachmann and Tischendorf, in the parallel passage of Matt. xiii. 55. (comp. Matt. xxvii. 56.), James and Joseph, and the variation of reading (Ἰάση, Ἰωσήτος, Ἰώσηφος) even in the text of Mark, vi. Against this difficulty, which is in some degree increased by the circumstance that Mary the mother of James and Joses receives this special designation, may be further set the circumstance that we are thus relieved from the equal difficulty of supposing that the two Marys were sisters.

20 brother. Now the things which I write unto you,
 21 behold, before God, I lie not. Afterwards I came into
 22 the regions of Syria and Cilicia; and was unknown
 by face unto the churches of Judæa which were in
 23 Christ: but they had heard only, That he which perse-
 cuted us in times past now preacheth the faith which
 24 once he destroyed. And they glorified God in me.

20. As in Rom. i. 9., we have an asseveration that at first sight appears out of place; for why should the Apostle assert so strenuously what no one would deny? The answer is, that the words do not refer to the particular statement which has preceded, but to the whole subject of the chapter. It is a matter of life and death to the Apostle to prove his independence of the twelve. Hence he says:—"Now, the things which I write unto you, behold, before God I lie not." That is, "Though I can have no other witness, I call God to witness that all I am saying is true, in reference to my independence of the other Apostles and the slight intercourse I had with them."

ὅτι has no regular construction. It depends upon the idea, "I declare," "I asseverate," contained in ἰδοὺ ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ.

21. Συρίας] Comp. Acts, ix. 30. :—"Which when the brethren knew, they brought him down to Cesarea and sent him forth to Tarsus." Comp. also, Acts, xv. 23., whence we gather, that the letter to the Churches, after the conference at Jerusalem, was addressed to the Gentiles in Antioch, and Syria, and Cilicia.

22. The purport of the remark

is again the same as that of the preceding verses, to show the slight connexion of the Apostle with the Church at Jerusalem:—"I was personally unknown to the Churches in the country of Judea."

It is urged, that, as the Apostle has just before described his going up to Jerusalem, he cannot mean to say here that he was unknown to the Church at Jerusalem; and, therefore, that τῆς Ἰουδαίας must refer to the Churches in the country. This is unnecessary. If St. Paul went up privately, κατ' ἰδίαν, it might well happen that he was unknown to the Church even at Jerusalem.

Far more difficult is it to reconcile the narrative of St. Paul with the Acts of the Apostles, in which he is described on his first visit as preaching boldly, and disputing against the Grecians, ix. 29.; and again, on a subsequent occasion, in xi. 30. as carrying up alms to Jerusalem,

23. μόνον δὲ ἀκούοντες ἦσαν, only they heard.] In what follows there is a confusion of the "oratio directa et obliqua." ὅτι indicates the substance of the rumour.

24. ἐν ἐμοί,] for what he had done in me.

ON THE CONVERSION OF ST. PAUL.

Εὐδόκησεν [ὁ θεός] . . . ἀποκαλύψαι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐμοί, ἵνα εὐαγγελίζωμαι αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι.—Gal. i. 15, 16.

CONVERSION is the turning of the heart and affections towards God. It may be the work of an instant, it may occupy many years ; it may diffuse itself imperceptibly over the whole of life. It may take place not at one time only, but occur again and again, and form a series of eras in our existence. It may arise from some accidental occasion ; it may seem like the reaction against some great sin. Nations as well as individuals have been subject to the all-transforming power. The conversion of St. Paul, the Apostle of the Gentiles, is the type and beginning, also, of the conversion of the world.

It is the nature of this great change to be independent of outward causes. It is not moral, but spiritual; that is to say, it transcends all the ordinary laws and known rules of our nature. It has a creative power of its own, which fashions the character of the individual and the institutions of the Church alike:—"We are the clay, and He the potter." When we consider mankind from without, they seem to have only a mechanical being; creatures, as they are often termed, of circumstances, dependent on habit, education, associations. When we consider them from within, we seem almost incapable of analysing our common nature ; so rapid is the current of emotions, so absolute and unlimited our apparent freedom. The change which we are considering is the highest act of this freedom of which men are capable, directed towards its highest object. It implies that at some time in their life they pass into new relations with God, and anticipate nature by grace, and have a new life breathed into their members. What they experience, may be described in the words of the Evangelist respecting our Lord:—"The Spirit of God descends upon them in a bodily form, like a dove, and rests upon them."

An illustration may help us to figure the meaning of Conversion. Take the case of disease, especially in youth, growing on the body,

and disarranging its structure, until, in the language of medicine, the disorder has become chronic, that is to say, a sort of bodily habit which ordinary remedies are powerless to remove. Suddenly, perhaps from change of air, or other external circumstances, or some latent power in the constitution itself, the disease takes a favourable turn; a new well-spring of health seems to gush forth; nature restores itself without the aid of the physicians. In such cases no one will pretend to explain the method of its operation; its resources are in itself. The physician faintly guesses at the conditions and accidents, rather than the causes of the results. He is willing to borrow the language of religion, and speaks of the recovery in a secondary sense, as a miracle or a mystery.

What is true of our physical, is yet more [true of our moral, and most of all of our spiritual nature. There is much in it which appears accidental, not because it really is so, but because it is too subtle for us to trace. To the eye of omniscience there may be many things which are but the stray threads of a complicated web,—indications, on the surface, of that which has an origin far below. In the case of other men we know little of the process by which they came to be what they are, and are ever liable to seize on some accidental circumstance—the death of a relative, the impression produced by a sermon, &c., as the true account of what was preparing long before. Other men cannot put us in possession of what their life has been, of the antecedents and consequents of their actions. In our own case, we seem to know more about ourselves rather than really do so. When we reflect upon the growth of our own character, the many influences that have surrounded us, the slow additions by which our mind has been built up, so far from “looking upon our natural face as in a glass,” we have but a distant and transient image of our former self.

We feel that this character of ours grew up we cannot tell how. So far as we have not been the slaves of passion, the creatures of circumstances, the blind adherents of custom,—so far as we have risen above our animal nature, and rested in things unseen,—so far as our will has been truly free,—so far as we have been spiritual beings, we can give no account of ourselves at all. We know that without the

ordinary means being employed, by some natural or spiritual growth we have often become different from what we were before. It was not that good actions produced good habits, or that good advice led to good actions. This may have had to do with our change; but we cannot conceive such ethical processes as really effecting it, any more than, in the case of disease, the prescriptions of the physician were the cause of returning health. It was not that we tried to do better exactly; for often the time of effort would be the time of weakness and restlessness, the period of repose that of vigour and strength. If we examine the days or hours in which we have best fulfilled our task, and been most equal to the duties of life, are they not those, not in which the will, with painful self-denial, was laboriously dragged after, but in which it went forth spontaneous, to rejoice in the service of God and man?

The mystery in which our whole moral being is involved, necessarily obscures the greatest change of which our moral nature is capable. There are changes of another kind, which we are, perhaps, as little able to analyse—moments of action or of passion, which have altered the whole course of after life. But they have not been without their outward sign appearing on the surface. The change of which we are speaking, is the first-love of the soul towards the unseen, the single heroic act in which more than life is at stake. To describe it adequately, is not within the power of language, and beyond the compass of human forms of thought. It can only take place by the soul passing out of itself; it can only be expressed in words that sound mystical; it remains only as a hidden life which, the moment we attempt to withdraw it from its retreat, and see it as in a certain sense it truly is, becomes changed and different. "Ye are dead, and your life is hidden with Christ and God." It is a contrasted notion of himself the Christian has, "as dying, and behold he lives," as "unknown, and yet well known," standing in no relation to the outward world, upon which, except for purposes of action, he scarce permits himself to dwell. When other men call him good (as he truly is), he is ready to reply in the words which Christ used, not merely in irony but as conveying the true sense of human nature respecting itself, "Why callest thou me good?"

Such views may be censured as mystical, and as tending to discourage the due use of the means and instruments of religion. It would carry us beyond the subject of the present essay to consider the safeguards by which they may be surrounded. It is sufficient for us to say, with the Apostle, "God forbid; how shall we, who are dead to sin, live any longer therein?" Neither can it be denied that these spiritual experiences fall to the lot of but a small portion of mankind. Many good men are Christians in unconsciousness, rather than consciously, ready to take up the cross and follow Christ, and to give the cup of cold water to the disciple, and to forgive their brother until seventy and seven times, yet scarcely aware of the personal relation in which the Scriptures teach that they stand towards their Lord and Master. Many good men, too, it must be acknowledged, seem to lead a life such as does not at all correspond to the language of Scripture and of the Apostle, a life led after the manner of men, for this world, rather than another, in which habit and custom and opinion are strong, and faith and grace weak, which passes away from the cradle to the tomb with singularly little of evil, but without any great good.

But whatever danger there may be indirectly flowing from such views, whatever safeguards they may need for their protection, however little they may correspond to the actual experience of a large portion of mankind, they present us with that aspect of human nature which is set forth in the Epistles of St. Paul. The language uniformly employed in them is not the staid, dignified discourse of the philosopher, but the language of ecstasy; as of one who had gone through the greatest transition possible to any human soul; who all his life long was passing through similar transitions; who, as it were, was ever carrying with him, in one, the past and the present; dwelling between darkness and light; having the sentence of death in himself, and yet more than a conqueror. Even the ordinary events of this life do not appear to him as to other men. They show him the will of God; they remind him of the love of Christ; they reflect the wrath and mercy of God; to himself mercy, to the world at large conveying a mingled message of wrath and mercy; the double sentence which at different times he, too, had felt

in the workings of his own soul. He is raised into another state of being ; the life which he leads is not his own, but " Christ living in him."

Thus we are led to view the conversion of St. Paul, not as a mere accident of his life, but as intimately connected with his whole character, throwing a light on his labours in the service of the Gospel, and especially on his writings, and hardly less so on the state of the first believers. He who was converted in an instant is the same as he who preaches that through faith we are righteous before God without the deeds of the law. The doctrine of the Apostle is the central fact of his life. As Christ called him at once from darkness to light, so also might other men be called, not by the burden of ordinances, or the circuitous methods of the Book of the Law, but by looking upon Christ face to face, as he himself had done. Nor, indeed, except in the circumstances of the vision which accompanied it, is the conversion of St. Paul materially different from that of the three thousand on the day of Pentecost, or the other conversions mentioned in the Acts, or that of the barbarians in later times. Remembering, then, that it is to the character of St. Paul we must look for the illustration of his Epistles, and that his life and character centre in his conversion, and also that in this we find the image of that spiritual change which at sundry times, and in divers manners, every Christian experiences in himself, it will not appear out of place in the present work, to consider at length the conversion of St. Paul, and especially those aspects of it which he himself presents to us.

The only passages in the Epistles in which St. Paul has been supposed to allude to his conversion, are :—

1 Cor. ix. 1. :—" Am I not an apostle ? am I not free ? have I not seen Christ Jesus our Lord ?"

1 Cor. xv. 7—9. :—" After that, he was seen of James ; then of all the apostles. And last of all he was seen of me also, as of one born out of due time. For I am the least of the apostles, that am not meet to be called an apostle, because I persecuted the Church of God."

2 Cor. xii. 2—4. :—"I knew a man in Christ above fourteen years ago, (whether in the body, I cannot tell ; or out of the body, I cannot tell : God knoweth ;) such an one caught up to the third heaven.

"And I knew such a man, (whether in the body, or out of the body, I cannot tell ;) God knoweth :

"How that he was caught up into paradise, and heard unspeakable words, which it is not lawful for a man to utter."

Gal. i. 15. 16. :—"But when it pleased God, who separated me from my mother's womb, and called me by his grace,

"To reveal his Son in me, that I might preach him among the heathen." To which may be added :

Acts, ix. 3—7. :—"And as he journeyed he came near Damascus : and suddenly there shined round about him a light from heaven :

"And he fell to the earth, and heard a voice, saying unto him, Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me ?

"And he said, Who art thou, Lord ? And the Lord said, I am Jesus whom thou persecutest : it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks.

"And he trembling and astonished said, Lord, what wilt thou have me to do ? And the Lord said unto him, Arise, and go into the city, and it shall be told thee what thou must do.

"And the men which journeyed with him stood speechless, hearing a voice, but seeing no man."

Compare with last verse Acts xxii. 9. :—"And they that were with me saw indeed the light, and were afraid ; but they heard not the voice of him that spake to me." And xxvi. 14. : — "And when we were *all fallen* to the earth."

There is no fact in history more certain or undisputed than that, in some way or other, by an inward vision or revelation of the Lord, or by an outward miraculous appearance as he was going to Damascus, the Apostle was suddenly converted from being a persecutor to become a preacher of the Gospel. The slight variations between Acts ix. 7. and Acts xxvi. 14., in the first of which, "the men that journey with him" are described as "standing speechless," and in the

second, as "falling to the ground;" or between Acts ix. and Acts xxii., where in the narrative his companions are spoken of as "hearing a voice, but seeing no man," in the speech before the Jews as "seeing the light, but not hearing the words spoken;" however such differences occurring in the same writer are to be accounted for (whether by a difference in the original source, or by a different object in the composer himself), cannot be thought to shake the credibility of the general fact. They are, perhaps, analogous to the different representations of the multitude respecting a similar occurrence in the life of our Lord, of which one said, "it thundereth;" others said, "an angel hath spoken to him." While, however, we maintain that they are of no weight, as tending to prove the mythical or unhistorical character of the narrative, we are in fairness bound to admit that they show we cannot argue from its minute details.

The most remarkable of these variations occurs in St. Paul's discourse before Agrippa, Acts xxvi. 16—18., where, in addition to the words spoken by the voice from heaven, which are common to the other accounts, are given the following:—

"But rise, and stand upon thy feet: for I have appeared unto thee for this purpose, to make thee a minister and a witness both of these things which thou hast seen, and of those things in the which I will appear unto thee,

"Delivering thee from the people, and from the Gentiles, unto whom now I send thee,

"To open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in me."

To which there is nothing parallel in the narrative of the ix. of Acts, except ver. 6.:—

"And he trembling and astonished said, Lord, what wilt thou have me to do? And the Lord said unto him, Arise, and go into the city, and it shall be told thee what thou must do."

Nor in the address to the multitude, ch. xxii. 10., the corresponding words of which are as follow:—

“And I said, What shall I do, Lord? And the Lord said unto me, Arise, and go into Damascus; and there it shall be told thee of all things which are appointed for thee to do.”

There is no use in attempting any forced reconciliation of the two narratives. That of Acts xxvi. 16. has been quoted to show, that St. Paul's after-recollection of the vision on his way to Damascus was not altogether one of fear, as of a man struck to the earth and gradually recovering himself, but rather that his thoughts carried him back to that very time, as the hour in which he had received his glorious mission to preach the Gospel to the Gentiles. There would seem, therefore, to be no improbability in itself in the vision which he describes in 2 Cor. xii. 2. as happening above fourteen years ago (in which he says he will glory when he dares not glory of himself), when he heard unspeakable words, being the same with that which he saw at his conversion. And it might perhaps be urged, that the same train of thought which at the end of the eleventh chapter led him to speak of his escape from Damascus, carried him a step further back in the history of his life to the great event which preceded it. On the other hand it may be said:—(1.) that St. Paul had other visions of Christ; (2.) that he does not allude to this as the great event which they all knew of, his conversion; (3.) that the date disagrees, as upon any calculation St. Paul cannot be supposed to have written the Second Epistle to the Corinthians less than eighteen years after his conversion.

These reasons are not so absolutely conclusive as to exclude the possibility of the two occasions being the same; but they are at least sufficient to prevent our arguing from the words “whether in the body, or out of the body, I cannot tell,” that the conversion of St. Paul was an inward fact. They are words that he might very possibly have used to describe the ecstasy of his conversion, but there is no proof that he did. The passage of Acts xxvi. 16., which was before quoted, may nevertheless throw light on another critical question, viz. whether the occasions which he alludes to in 1 Cor. ix. 1., xv. 7—9., when “he saw the Lord,” are the same with the occasion of his conversion or not. In 1 Cor. ix. 1. he evidently seems to allude

to the vision of Christ as the proof of his commission as an Apostle, and also as an event well known to them. We can scarcely suppose that there was some celebrated occasion of which the Corinthian Church were aware, besides his conversion, when he received authority from Christ. And the passage in the Acts, as has already been remarked, shows that in the Apostle's mind his mission to the Gentiles was a part of the very message of conversion; not that Christ first appeared to him, and then followed an interval, and at length he was informed of his high calling; but according to the quaint expression of Donne "He was a fusile apostle, an apostle cast in a mould at once; the same lightning was the fire which melted him and the mould in which he was formed." The comparison of 1 Cor. ix. 2. with Acts xxvi. 16. leads decidedly to the supposition that they refer to the same occasion; nor need we in 1 Cor. xv. 7—9. assume another vision of Christ, as although we gather from the Acts of the Apostles (xxii. 17.), as well as from his own writings, that St. Paul had other visions and revelations of the Lord, it is probably to the most important of these appearances he would allude, when speaking of the occasions on which Christ was seen after the resurrection, by himself and the other Apostles.

More important than any reconciliation of the variations of the Acts, is the question—"In what light the vision on the way to Damascus was regarded by St. Paul himself." The only other passage which has not yet been considered, Gal. i. 15. 16. "When it pleased God, who separated me from my mother's womb, and called me by his grace, to reveal his Son in me, that I might preach him among the heathen," as it confirms the view which has been already taken, so also leads us further to suppose that whether the conversion of St. Paul was an outward or an inward fact, it was not principally the outward appearance in the heavens, but the inward effect that the Apostle would have regarded. Compare Eph. iii. 3. :—"How that by revelation he made known unto me the mystery; (as I wrote afore in few words.)"

It has been often remarked, that miracles are not appealed to singly in Scripture as evidences of religion, in the same way that

they have been used by modern writers. Especially does this remark apply to the conversion of St. Paul. Not a hint is found in his writings that he regarded "the heavenly vision" as an objective evidence of Christianity. The evidence to him was the sudden change of heart; what he terms, in the case of his converts, the reception of the Spirit; what he had known, and what he felt; the fact that one instant he was a persecutor, and the second a preacher of the Gospel. The last inquiry that he would have thought of making, would be that of modern theologians—"How, without some outward sign, he could be assured of the reality of what he had seen and heard." No outward sign could, as such, have convinced the mind of a man who fell to the ground amazed, unless it were certain that his companions had seen the light and heard the voice. Nor unless they had distinctly been partakers of the supernatural vision, could he ever have been satisfied that what they saw was anything but a meteor, or lightning, or that the voice they heard was more than the sound of thunder. No evidence of theirs would have been an answer to the language of some of the rationalist divines:—"St. Paul was overtaken by a storm of thunder and lightning in the neighbourhood of Damascus." Such difficulties are insuperable; at best, we can only raise probabilities in answer to them, based on the general tone of the narrative in Acts ix. But we may remember that the belief in some¹ outward fact was

¹ As the expressions "outward and inward fact" have occurred several times in the preceding pages, and are of great importance in the statement of many theological questions, it may be convenient to consider in this place the precise line of distinction to be drawn between them:—(1.) An outward fact is one which is seen either by more persons than one, who cannot be supposed to be under any common impulse, or by a single person in an unimpassioned state of mind. (2.) From this an inward fact is distinguished, not by a less degree of reality, but by taking its origin within. In the one case we begin with a sensible impression; in the other, we may sometimes end with one, which is, of course, a mere creation of imagination, and proves nothing about its objective truth. It may even happen that from sympathy several persons may agree in supposing themselves to have seen—that is, may have imagined—the same external appearance. Nothing of this kind can serve as a criterion of a true internal fact. We must have some other

not the essential point in St. Paul's faith, and therefore we need not make it the essential point in our own.

If we submit the narrative of the Acts to the ordinary rules of evidence, we shall scarcely find ourselves able to determine whether any outward fact was intended by it, or not. Such is, indeed, the impression at first sight conveyed; but we must remember that this impression is gathered from an author to whom the distinction of the spiritual and supernatural, which is so familiar to ourselves, had scarcely an existence; who, if he had been asked the question which we are now considering, would probably have replied:—"Whether in the body, or out of the body, I cannot tell." It must be observed, further, that the more objective character given to the event in the Acts, compared with that implied in the allusions of St. Paul himself, is but such a difference as we might expect between the impressions made upon his own mind, and the colour that the circumstance would naturally acquire when conceived by another. And the wavering of the different accounts, which has been already dwelt upon, as it prevents our insisting on the details, so also forbids our attaching much importance to the external or objective character of the event itself.

It is not upon the testimony of any single person, even were it far more distinct than in the present instance, we can venture to peril the truth of the Christian religion. Weak defences of comparatively unimportant points undermine more than they support. He who has the Spirit of Christ and his Apostles, has the witness in himself: he

grounds for being assured:—(1.) that it is not a mere illusion, either of imagination at the time or of memory afterwards; (2.) that it does not arise from some bodily state, not of course in the general sense in which all mental action is dependent on, or connected with the body, but in the more precise sense in which delirium, or if there be such a thing, clairvoyance may be termed bodily states. These criteria will be to ourselves—(1.) the degree of distinctness with which we not only remember the internal fact, but also associate it with external objects, with particular occasions or places; (2.) what we remember ourselves, or others may have observed, of our state at the time; (3.) lastly, in such facts as the conversion of St. Paul the permanent influence on the character and actions, which can be attributed to nothing but a sudden internal impression.

who leads the life of Paul, has already set his seal that his words are true. Were the other view supported by the most irrefragable historical evidence, had the sign in the clouds been beheld by whole multitudes of Jews and Gentiles, believers and unbelievers, it is to the internal aspect of the event we should be more inclined to turn, both as the more religious one, and the one which more closely links the Apostle with ourselves.

The vision which Paul saw on the way to Damascus, followed him through his whole life. There was one image which hovered over him, one thought which urged him onward, one spirit which he breathed, one life which he lived, the image, the thought, the spirit, the life of Christ. In the ruder times of Christianity we have heard of saints whose eyes were ever fixed on the material image of the crucified Redeemer, who bore in their body the marks of the Lord Jesus. What is true of them in a grosser and more literal sense, is true of St. Paul figuratively and spiritually: he felt himself and all other Christians to be crucified with Christ. In all his affliction they are afflicted, even as they are the partakers of his glory, dying with him in sin and to sin, buried in baptism, filling up in their body the measure of his suffering, partaking of his hidden life in the grave, that with him also they may rise again. If the Apostle rejoices, he is as one risen with Christ; if he suffers, he is crucified with Him; if at one and the same instant he suffers, and triumphs, and is a spectacle to the world, to angels, and to men, he is but as Christ was, Who was lifted up from the earth that He might draw all men after Him. He is as one stricken to the earth, at the same time that he partakes of the vision of the Divine glory.

It is this thought and image of Christ, not freedom or faith, or any form of the subjective principle, which is the primary idea of the Gospel in the mind of the Apostle. Neither is it the belief in Christ as an object without him, to whom he is to transfer all his sins, but the ever present consciousness of Christ within him, who is one and inseparable from him, that is the support and anchor of his soul. To us, who know of Christ at a distance, who often for the first time on our death-bed, seek to cast the burden of our life on Him, it is hard to

conceive how any can have made this absolute unity of the soul with Christ the first principle of their faith; how any can have felt such an entire and living communion with Him, as not only to propose Him as an example, but to impersonate and embody Him in all their actions.

The life of most men is divided into two parts: their ordinary life, in which they take thought for what they shall eat, what they shall drink, and wherewithal they shall be clothed; and their religious life, in which for an hour of each day, or a day in each week, they devote themselves to the service of God. But the life of St. Paul we can scarcely think of as admitting such a distinction; compared with that of ordinary men it was supernatural, a miracle, an ecstasy, a revelation, an inspiration of the Lord. The stream of Divine light, which poured upon him at his conversion, illumined his whole life, and followed in his track as he went forth to convert the world. He is not merely the preacher of righteousness, but mighty to the pulling down of strongholds; he sees more clearly than they all; his words are with demonstration of the Spirit and with power; he communicates to others that which he feels in himself, the life and fire of the Gospel. It is this ecstatic side of his nature which with the ever present sense of Divine things blended "a love passing that of women" towards his friends and converts, that we seem to trace back to that moment, when his soul was first melted by the love of Christ, and he sent forth at once to preach the Gospel to the Gentiles.

Whether in his natural temperament there was anything akin to his after life, whether the vision of Stephen praying for his persecutors may have been the natural preparation for the event which followed, whether the words of the Martyr were more likely to prick him to the soul or to arouse his indignation, is a question of which the Scripture gives us no opportunity of judging. It is his after, and not his previous, life that we are best able to connect with his conversion. As it is to the Apostle more than any other human teacher we trace back the great doctrine of righteousness by faith, so to this event in his life we must refer that impression of Divine truth, which

opened the kingdom of heaven to all mankind by the sight of Christ Himself. St. Paul was the human medium through which it was conveyed ; an Apostle not of man, neither by man, but of Jesus Christ, in whom it pleased God to reveal His Son. As it was necessary for the other Apostles that Christ should go away, or otherwise the Comforter would not come unto them, so also it was in a certain sense a pre-eminence that he possessed over them, that as one born out of due time he had not known Christ according to the flesh, but only in a heavenly and spiritual manner.

ἔπειτα διὰ δεκατεσσάρων ἐτῶν πάλιν ἀνέβην εἰς Ἱεροσό- 2
 λυμα μετὰ Βαρνάβα, συμπαραλαβὼν καὶ Τίτον· ἀνέβην δὲ 2
 κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν, καὶ ἀνεθέμην αὐτοῖς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὃ
 κηρύσσω ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, κατ' ἰδίαν δὲ τοῖς δοκοῦσιν, μὴ
 πῶς εἰς κενὸν τρέχω ἢ ἔδραμον. ἀλλ' οὐδὲ Τίτος ὁ σὺν ἐμοὶ 3

II. The Apostle proceeds with his narrative, the object of which is to indicate the relation in which he stood to the Twelve on a memorable occasion. This was the occasion of his dispute with the Church at Jerusalem, at which they added nothing to him; he himself bore the brunt of the battle with the Judaizers. He never thought for an instant of giving way; and at last "the pillars of the Church," who had stood aloof from the controversy, agreed to leave him to himself. They would sanction, but not share his mission to the Gentiles.

On another occasion, when Peter came to Antioch, he showed the same independent spirit, boldly charging the Apostle with inconsistency, when, acting under the influence of the Church at Jerusalem, he refused to eat with the Gentiles. He gives what may be termed a dramatic sketch of his answer to Peter, which soon expands into an answer to the Galatian Church, which he more openly attacks at the beginning of the third chapter.

1. ἔπειτα διὰ δεκατεσσάρων ἐτῶν, *then fourteen years.*] That is, fourteen years after the great epoch of his conversion, or fourteen years after his previous journey. For the question whether this occasion is the same as that of Acts xv. see note at the end of the chapter.

μετὰ Βαρνάβα, συμπαραλαβὼν καὶ Τίτον, *with Barnabas.*]

Therefore, before the separation of Paul and Barnabas. Titus is mentioned to prepare the way for what follows. Comp. Acts xv. 2:—"Paul and Barnabas and certain others of them."

2. κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν, *by revelation.*] Comp. i. 12. and Acts xvi. 8:—"But the Spirit of Jesus (so Lachmann) suffered them not;" also Acts xix. 21. The Apostle means, that he went up, not because he was sent for, but because it was revealed to him that he should go. Compare, so far as a heathen parallel is in point, the δαιμόνιον σύμειον of Socrates, which in the same way gave intimations respecting his going out and coming in.

ἀνεθέμην αὐτοῖς.] St. Paul speaks of the Gospel which he preached among the Gentiles, and laid before the Apostles as a separate Gospel, as below ver. 7. εὐαγγέλιον τῆς ἀκροευστίας. Compare Rom. xvi. 25., εὐαγγέλιόν μου.

τοῖς δοκοῦσιν, *to them of reputation.*] Is used absolutely, as sometimes in classical Greek, to the men of influence, reputation. There is a degree of irony in the application of the term to the Apostles, who, as St. Paul is about to describe, added nothing to him. The irony is heightened by the altered form of expression in ver. 6., οἱ δοκοῦντες

- 2 Then fourteen years after I went up again to Jerusalem with Barnabas, and took Titus with me also.
 2 And I went up by revelation, and communicated unto them that gospel which I preach among the Gentiles, but privately to them which were of reputation, lest by
 3 any means I should run, or had run, in vain. But neither Titus, who was with me, being a Greek, was

εἶναι τῷ, but is lost again in the new turn given to it at ver. 9., *οἱ δοκοῦντες σὺλλοι εἶναι*, the last words marking his unfeigned respect for the other Apostles. Comp. 2 Cor. xi. 5., xii. 11. — *οἱ ὑπερλίαν ἀπόστολοι*.

μή πως εἰς κενὸν τρέχω ἢ ἔδραμον, *lest by any means I should run, or had run, in vain.*] St. Paul went up to lay the dispute about circumcision before the Church at Jerusalem. He went up by revelation, and yet thought it necessary to feel his way with the heads of the Church, lest he should run in vain. What was the fear which he intended to convey in these words, and which led him to this private course of procedure? did it arise from distrust of them, or of himself? could there have been a time when he had not felt so sure as he afterwards became that he was right about circumcision? On this view he would be telling us in the present passage, that he had once been diffident and desirous to confirm his own judgment by that of the Twelve. And he was strengthened in his opinion, not by what the other Apostles told him, but by his finding that they had nothing to tell him. On the other hand, the character of St.

Paul, and still more the context of the passage, are inconsistent with his feeling or saying that he could have been in error, or could be enlightened by others. But it is quite consistent with his conduct on other occasions, Acts xxi. 26., and very natural that he should act with prudence in a Church where there were so “many thousand Jews which believed, and they all zealous for the law.” He might well hope for union and fear separation, even though separation could never shake his belief in what he surely knew. Anxiety was a part of his natural temperament: everywhere he seems like one feeling the effect of his words; and on such an occasion there would be many reasons for it, one amongst them being the slightness of his acquaintance with the other Apostles. It seems better therefore to consider the meaning of the passage in a general way:—“I spoke privately first to a few of the leaders, lest my business should miscarry.” *ἔδραμον* may either refer to the journey to Jerusalem which he had already accomplished, or is perhaps a mere grammatical correction, as the past tense *ἀνεθέμην* has preceded. *τρέχω* may be either indicative or subjunctive.

Ελλην ὃν ἡναγκάσθη περιτμηθῆναι· διὰ δὲ τοὺς παρεισ- 4
 άκτους ψευδαδέλφους, οἵτινες παρεισῆλθον κατασκοπήσαι
 τὴν ἐλευθερίαν ἡμῶν ἣν ἔχομεν ἐν χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, ἵνα ἡμᾶς
 καταδουλώσουσιν¹, οἷς οὐδὲ πρὸς ὥραν εἴξαμεν τῇ ὑποταγῇ, 5

¹ καταδουλώσονται.

3—5. οἷς οὐδὲ πρὸς ὥραν.] A various reading occurs in verse 5, which will most conveniently be considered in this place, as it affects the meaning of the passage which precedes. The words οἷς οὐδὲ are omitted on the authority of Irenæus, who quotes the verse without them, and of Tertullian, who affirms them to have been an insertion of Marcion. Assuming the correctness of the omission, the sense may be either:—“But Titus, who was with me, being a Greek, was circumcised, though not by compulsion, but the fact was that, on account of the false brethren who crept in unawares to spy out our liberty in Christ Jesus, we gave way for a season, that we might preserve the truth to you the Gentile Christians;” or ver. 4. and 5. may be contrasted with ver. 3.—“We did not circumcise Titus; but we gave way for the moment because of the false brethren, not weakly to compromise the truth of the Gospel, but to preserve it to you.”

But as the MS. authority is in favour of the insertion of οἷς οὐδὲ, it is useless to speculate further on its possible omission. It might indeed be maintained that, even retaining these words, we may still suppose Titus to have been circumcised, if the stress is laid on the word ἡναγκάσθη. “Titus who was with me, was circumcised, though not of compulsion; but I and the other Apo-

stles thought it better that this should be done to prevent the false brethren from going about and saying that we had men uncircumcised among us, though we did not give way to them for an instant.”

Such is a possible train of thought in the Apostle's mind, whichever reading we adopt. Either of the explanations derives plausibility from the conduct of St. Paul at Jerusalem on the occasion of his last visit, and would be in some degree confirmed by the charges which appear to have been made against him in Galatia of preaching the circumcision. It would afford another instance of “his becoming to the Jews a Jew.” The want of point in the words οἷς οὐδὲ πρὸς ὥραν might also be regarded as characteristic of the Apostle. But the general context of the passage leads to a different explanation. The Apostle is not in the temper of accommodation; it was not the time to be all things to all men at his meeting with the other Apostles at Jerusalem, nor the time to tell the Galatians if he had been so. For his whole object is to show how little he gave way to the Jewish Christians, and how independently of the Twelve he maintained his cause. It would be a far-fetched supposition, that he mentioned the case of Titus because the false teachers had brought it forward against him;

- 4 compelled to be circumcised : but* because of the false brethren unawares brought in, who came in privily to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus, that
5 they might bring us into bondage :—to whom we gave place by subjection, no, not for an hour ; that the truth

and otherwise, there would be no reason for his mentioning it himself. Why should he gratuitously introduce a weak point which made against his own argument? Moreover, the words, "Ἕλλην ὦν and *τίτα ἡ ἀληθεία τοῦ εὐαγγελίου διαμείρη πρὸς ὑμᾶς*, are wholly unmeaning, if Titus was circumcised. There is good sense in saying :—"For Titus being a Greek was not circumcised, &c., that the truth of the Gospel might remain unto you Gentiles ;" but the point is altogether lost if we turn the sentence :—"For Titus being a Greek was not circumcised by compulsion ; but merely as a matter of prudence, that the truth of the Gospel to the Gentiles might continue."

It is, doubtless, most agreeable to the connexion, to suppose, that Titus was not circumcised. In the previous verse the Apostle had said :—"I laid the dispute respecting circumcision before the heads of the Church, lest my business should miscarry." Now he adds :—"But notwithstanding this apparent concession, we did not give up the rights of the Gentiles so far as to allow Titus to be circumcised ;" though, as is implied in the word *ἡναγκάσθη*, there was an attempt to compel this. So far all is plain ; the difficulty is, what to do with the succeeding clauses. That the two verses which follow, are an anacoluthon, is obvious. There

are two ways in which the wanting thought may be supplied :—either, (1.) we may suppose the words, *διὰ δὲ τοῦς παρεισάκτους ψευδαδέλφους*, to be connected with *ἡναγκάσθη*, as though the idea in the Apostle's mind were,—"yet because of the false brethren there was compulsion ;" or, (2.) these words may contain the reason why, as he tells us in ver. 5., he refused to yield for an instant. This latter meaning would be naturally expressed without the anacoluthon, by the omission of *οἷς*, which in this case may, probably, have been added on account of the length of the sentence, like the *ὃ* in the doxology at the end of the Epistle to the Romans. Altogether, three ideas seem to be struggling for expression in these ambiguous clauses :—(1.) Titus was not circumcised ; (2.) though an attempt was made by the false brethren to compel him ; (3.) which as a matter of principle we thought it so much the more our duty to resist. The ambiguity has arisen from the double connexion in which the clause *διὰ τοῦς παρεισάκτους ψευδαδέλφους* stands, (1.) to *ἡναγκάσθη* which precedes, and (2.) to *οἷς οὐδὲ πρὸς ὥραν εἴξαμεν* which follow.

4. *οἵτινες παρεισῆλθον, who came in sideways.*] Comp. *παρεισάκτους* before.

κατασκοπῆσαι τὴν ἐλευθερίαν

ἵνα ἡ ἀλήθεια τοῦ εὐαγγελίου διαμείνῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς. ἀπὸ δὲ 6
τῶν δοκούντων εἶναι τι (ὅποιοί ποτε ἦσαν, οὐδέν μοι
διαφέρει· πρόσωπον θεὸς ἀνθρώπου οὐ λαμβάνει) ἐμοὶ
γὰρ οἱ δοκοῦντες οὐδὲν προσανέθεντο, ἀλλὰ τούναντίον 7
ιδόντες ὅτι πεπίστευμαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς ἀκροβυστίας
καθὼς Πέτρος τῆς περιτομῆς (ὁ γὰρ ἐνεργήσας Πέτρῳ εἰς 8
ἀποστολὴν τῆς περιτομῆς ἐνήργησεν καὶ μοι εἰς τὰ ἔθνη)
καὶ γνόντες τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι Ἰάκωβος καὶ 9

ἡμῶν, *to spy out our liberty.*] It is not likely that the "false brethren," any more than the "false apostles," were only Jews. Except as professing Christians, there could have been no reason for their admission to the assemblies of the believers. That Jews and Christians must have passed into each other by insensible gradations, is obvious from such passages as the discourse of James to Paul, in Acts xxi. 17., as well as from the narrative of Hegesippus and Josephus respecting James himself. The object of the false brethren was to spy out whether Paul and Barnabas conformed to the law, or not; what Paul calls their liberty in Christ Jesus.

εἵξαμεν τῇ ὑποταγῇ.] Either, "we yielded in subjection;" or, "we yielded to subjection."

5. πρὸς ὥραν.] Comp. 2 Cor. vii. 8.; Philem. 15.; 1 Thess. ii. 17.

ἡ ἀλήθεια τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, *the truth of the Gospel.*] That is, the Gospel as St. Paul preached it in its freedom, of faith and not of works.

διαμείνῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς,] may remain for you Gentiles.

6. ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν δοκούντων εἶναι τι, *but of those who seemed.*] This sentence is interrupted by a parenthesis. We may suppose the Apostle intended to finish it

thus:—"But of those who seemed to be somewhat, I received nothing." οἱ δοκοῦντες εἶναι τι, "who seemed to be somewhat;" "who," as we should say, "gave the impression of being the chief men."

ὅποιοί ποτε ἦσαν.] These words are a slight correction of the preceding, which of itself shows that the οἱ δοκοῦντες εἶναι τι cannot be taken in a bad sense. The Apostle fears that he has said too much in the words, ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν δοκούντων εἶναι τι—"But from those who seemed to be of reputation. I do not mean to say that this makes any difference to me. I think of men only as they are in the sight of God, who accepts no man's person. For what I am going to say is, that those of estimation added nothing unto me." The parenthesis is the correction of the clause with which the verse began; and the words, ἐμοὶ γὰρ, &c., with which the anacoluthon is resumed, supply a kind of ground for the words in the parenthesis. He might seem to depreciate the other Apostles, and he gives his reason for it:—"For they added nothing to me." It is probable that γὰρ has a further retrospective meaning, going back to ver. 5.:—"I acted boldly, for others did not act."

7. ἀλλὰ τούναντίον, *but contrariwise.*] In what does this

- 6 of the gospel might continue with you. But of those who seemed to be somewhat,—(whatsoever they were, it maketh no matter to me: God accepteth not * man's person :) for they who seemed to be somewhat in con-
 7 ference added nothing to me: but contrariwise, when they saw that the gospel of the uncircumcision was committed unto me, as the gospel of the circumcision was
 8 unto Peter, (for he that wrought effectually in Peter to the apostleship of the circumcision, the same wrought*
 9 effectually in me toward the Gentiles :) and when James,

opposition consist? Apparently in this, that instead of strengthening the hands of Paul, they left him to fight his own battle. They said "Take your own course; preach the Gospel of the uncircumcision to Gentiles, and we will preach the Gospel of the circumcision to Jews."

It is remarkable that in this passage St. Paul speaks, not only of preaching to Jews and Gentiles, but in yet stronger language of a different Gospel of the circumcision and uncircumcision. St. Peter is described in a way that harmonises with the pre-eminence assigned to him in the Gospels. He is the leader of the Jewish, as St. Paul of the Gentile Christians. That the teachers in the two spheres were not wholly separated, is shown by several of the companions of St. Paul in his imprisonment being οἱ ὄντες ἐκ περιτομῆς, Col. iv. 11.

8. In 1. Cor. ix. 2. the Apostle Paul appeals to his doing the work of an Apostle as a proof of his Apostleship; he here describes the same fact as producing its natural impression on the Twelve. They saw him to be in

another sphere what Peter was among themselves.

ὁ ἐνεργήσας,] like ὁ καλέσας, refers to God; comp. above ἀφορίσας. In Col. i. 29. St. Paul speaks of this Divine operation working in him as τὴν ἐνεργεῖαν [τοῦ Θεοῦ] τὴν ἐνεργουμένην ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐν δυνάμει. Also comp. 1 Cor. xi. 3.:—καὶ διαίρεσεις ἐνεργημάτων εἰσὶν ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς Θεὸς ὁ ἐνεργῶν τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν.

εἰς ἀποστολήν.] To the fulfilment of the Apostleship,—includes, like similar expressions, object and result at once.

9. τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι,] knowing that God had given me his grace. Compare Rom. i. 5. for the juxtaposition of χάριν and ἀποστολήν.

James and Cephas and John.] Some MSS. read Peter and James and John; a variation which has probably arisen from the habit of assigning the primacy to Peter. James may be mentioned first, as the leader of the Judaizing party; see below ver. 12. The order of the names is of itself a proof that James, the son of Zebedee, is not here meant, and is therefore an incidental confirmation of the narrative of his death in the Acts.

Κηφᾶς καὶ Ἰωάννης, οἱ δοκοῦντες στῦλοι εἶναι, δεξιὰς ἔδωκαν ἐμοὶ καὶ Βαρνάβᾳ κοινωνίας, ἵνα ἡμεῖς [μὲν¹] εἰς τὰ ἔθνη, αὐτοὶ δὲ εἰς τὴν περιτομήν, μόνον τῶν πτωχῶν ἵνα 10 μνημονεύωμεν· ὃ καὶ ἐσπούδασα αὐτὸ τοῦτο ποιῆσαι. ὅτε 11 δὲ ἦλθεν Κηφᾶς² εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν, κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτῷ

¹ Om. μέν.² Πέτρος.

οἱ δοκοῦντες στῦλοι εἶναι, *who seemed to be pillars.*] The word δοκοῦντες is a resumption of τοῖς δοκοῦσιν, and δοκοῦντες εἶναί τι, in ver. 2. and 6. For στῦλοι, compare Rev. iii. 12.—στῦλοι· ἐν τῷ ναῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ. It was a common Jewish figure, applied to teachers of the law. Schoettgen, i. 728, 729.

ἵνα... περιτομήν, *that...circumcision.*] How is this division of labour to be understood? Not if we may judge from the Acts, as though it were intended that Paul should confine himself to the Gentiles, and Peter to the circumcision; for in every place Paul first preached to the Jews, and in nearly every place the Judaizers followed in his track. It may mean either that St. Paul was not "to intrude on other men's labours;" or that one Gospel was to be preached to the Gentiles, leaving open the question of circumcision, and another to the Jews, enforcing or encouraging the practice. The sense in which the agreement was made may have been determined, either by the character of the Church, whether composed chiefly of Jewish or heathen Christians; or by its situation, whether in Palestine or elsewhere, or by the Gospel having been preached at a particular place by St. Paul, or by one of the Twelve. That, independently of his own labours, St. Paul found the faith of Christ growing up around him, and the preaching of others

coming into contact with his own, is implied in Rom. xv. 20.; 2 Cor. x. 13. We can hardly suppose that, in the fluctuating state of the Church, the agreement could have been strictly acted upon, especially in Churches like Antioch, in which both parties must have met.

10. μόνον... ἵνα μνημονεύωμεν, *only they would that we should remember.*] For the use of ἵνα in requests, compare 2 Cor. viii. 7. The poor are "the poor saints of Jerusalem," Rom. xv. 26. Their poverty may have arisen from the humble condition of the first believers, or from the persecutions which they suffered at the hands of kinsmen; possibly, also, from the community of goods, which at one time existed among them. If in the Church of Jerusalem, as well as in that of Thessalonica, the belief in the near coming of the Messiah, led either to the interruption of their daily employments, or the sale of their property, there would be no difficulty in accounting for their want.

It is a proof of the still unbroken unity of the Church, that the Jewish Christians were willing to receive, or the Gentiles to give alms; a presumption, which is further strengthened by the manner in which the obligation to contribute is viewed, both in the Epistles to the Romans and the Corinthians, Rom. xv. 27.: "They

Cephas, and John, who seemed to be pillars, perceived the grace that was given unto me, they gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship; that we should go
 10 unto the heathen, and they unto the circumcision. Only they would that we should remember the poor; the same
 11 which I also was forward to do. But when Cephas¹ was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because

¹ Peter.

thought it good, and their debtors they are; for if the Gentiles have participated with them in their spiritual things, they ought also to participate with them in temporal things." Compare 1 Cor. xvi. 1., ix. 1.

Two collections for the Church at Jerusalem are mentioned in the Acts: the first, that which was carried up on St. Paul's second journey from Antioch; the second, the collection in Macedonia and Achaia, which he brought with him on his last visit to Jerusalem, in the contributions to which the Galatians had themselves a share. We cannot say that either of them, or indeed any particular occasion, is intended by the words—"which, also, I too was earnest to do."

αὐτὸ τοῦτο] implies that it was the very thing which, even independent of the agreement, he desired, and intended to do.

11—21. The conduct of Peter is not easy to understand. Already, at the council or concordat of the Apostles, he had agreed to impose no burdens on the Gentile Christians; and at a much earlier period in the history of the Apostles, he had not only been charged with going in unto men uncircumcised and eating with them, but had taught others "that they were to call nothing

common or unclean." And now, not of his own free will, but under the influence of certain who came from Jerusalem, from a fear of the very same charge, "thou wentest in unto men uncircumcised and eatest with them," he held back, and seemed to view his Christian brethren with the feelings with which he would have regarded men who sat at meat in an idol's temple. It is remarkable, and may be considered as a proof of the truth of the history, that this conduct, however unintelligible, is in keeping with Peter's character. We recognise in it the lineaments of him who confessed Christ first, and first denied him; who began by refusing that Christ should wash his feet, and then said, "not my feet only, but my hands and my head;" who cut off the ear of the servant of the High Priest, when they came to take Jesus, and then forsook Him and fled. Boldness and timidity, first boldness, then timidity, were the characteristics of his nature. It was natural for such a one, though no longer strictly a Jew himself, to desire that others should conform to the prejudices of Jews; such conduct agreed with the bent of his own mind, though he formally disowned it. There is, we may observe, in many

ἀντέστην, ὅτι κατεγνωσμένος ἦν. πρὸ τοῦ γὰρ ἐλθεῖν 12
 τινὰς ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου μετὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν συνήσθιεν· ὅτε δὲ
 ἦλθον, ὑπέστελλεν καὶ ἀφώριζεν ἑαυτόν, φοβούμενος τοὺς
 ἐκ περιτομῆς, καὶ συννυπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ 13
 Ἰουδαῖοι, ὥστε καὶ Βαρνάβας συναπήχθη αὐτῶν τῇ ὑπο-
 κρίσει. ἀλλ' ὅτε εἶδον ὅτι οὐκ ὀρθοποδοῦσιν πρὸς τὴν 14
 ἀλήθειαν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, εἶπον τῷ Κηφᾷ ἔμπροσθεν

men, a sort of tenderness, to what they once were themselves; as there is another class of men who learn a lesson, but only to apply it under given circumstances. Something of this kind there may have been in St. Peter; a narrowness of perception, or secret sympathy with the Judaizing converts, which prevented his seeing the wider truth, which presented itself to St. Paul. At any rate, his was a disposition on which ancient habits and feelings were ever liable to return; whose heart could scarcely avoid lingering around the weak and beggarly elements of the law; on whom in age the lessons of youth were too prone to come back, "carrying him whither he would not." The charge which St. Paul brings against him was, inconsistency with himself; he was half a Gentile, and wanted to make the Gentiles altogether Jews. So in chapter vi. of the Galatians, ver. 13. he says of the Judaizing teachers—"For neither do they that have been circumcised keep the law;" in other words, even the Judaizers are inconsistent with themselves; they too charged on him, chap. v. 11., that he still preached circumcision.

11. *ὅτε ἐλθε, κ. τ. λ., but when Cephas, &c.*] The place here alluded to is Antioch in Syria,

whither the Apostles Saul and Barnabas returned after the meeting at Jerusalem. We have no means of knowing on what occasion or at what time the dispute here alluded to, took place. St. Paul was at Antioch with Barnabas, immediately after the council, and (probably by himself) at the close of his second Apostolical journey.

ὅτι κατεγνωσμένος ἦν, because he had incurred blame] The use of the participle is considered by Winer a Hebraism. The translation in the English version, "because he was to be blamed," is too strong. The meaning is neither "reprehendendus," nor "reprehensibilis;" but reprehensus," converted into an adjective.

12. The obvious meaning of this verse is, that Peter acted under the influence of certain that came from James. In all controversies the followers are less scrupulous than the leaders; in this case it is impossible for us to determine what was the degree of these persons' connexion with the brother of the Lord, or how far they were responsible for the conduct of the Galatian teachers. The words, however, imply that they were actually sent by James. It must be remembered that in Acts xxi. 18. James advises

- 12 he had* incurred blame. For before that certain came from James, he did eat with the Gentiles: but when they were come, he withdrew and separated himself, 13 fearing them which were of the circumcision. And the other Jews dissembled likewise with him; insomuch that Barnabas also was carried away with their dis- 14 simulation. But when I saw that they walked not uprightly according to the truth of the Gospel, I said unto Peter before them all, If thou being a Jew, livest

Paul to propitiate "the multitude zealous for the law," by performing a vow in the temple. His conduct on the present occasion, whether reconcilable or not with what is related of him in Acts, xv. is perfectly in accordance with the narrative just alluded to, as well as with the ecclesiastical tradition respecting him.

The attempts of Jerome, Chrysostom, and Theophylact, to show that the dispute between Peter and Paul was either a preconcerted controversy for the edification of believers, or that Cephas here mentioned was some obscure disciple, and not the Apostle, are not without interest, as illustrating the history of the interpretation of Scripture.

συνήσθαι.] The eating together among the Jews, as in the East at the present day, was a sign of close communion and fellowship. We can well imagine the feelings of aversion that would have to be subdued, before men of a different race or religion could be induced to eat at the same table. This was not, however, Peter's case; he had once eaten with the Gentiles, and would not now hold it a matter of principle, or even of feeling, to abstain from doing so.

Timidity, or the undue influence of others, was the cause of his conduct. Hence St. Paul charges him with hypocrisy, that is, with having implied an objection which he did not really feel, or which his previous custom did not justify.

Besides the antagonism in which this passage represents the two great Apostles, it throws an important light on the history of the Apostolic Church in the following respects:—(1.) As exhibiting Peter's relation to James, and his fear of those who were of the circumcision, whose leader we should have naturally supposed him to have been. (2.) Also, as portraying the state of indecision in which all, except St. Paul, even including Barnabas, were in reference to the observance of the Jewish law.

14. πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου. In reference to the truth of the Gospel; that is, as above, ver. 5. the truth of the Gospel which I preach among you, not of works, but of faith.

ἐμπροσθεν πάντων.] I spake openly to them, though they were all against me, and remonstrated with Peter:—

Why do you, who are yourself

πάντων Εἰ σὺ Ἰουδαῖος ὑπάρχων ἐθνικῶς καὶ οὐχ Ἰουδαϊκῶς ζῆς, πῶς ¹ τὰ ἔθνη ἀναγκάζεις Ἰουδαίῃν;

Ἡμεῖς φύσει Ἰουδαῖοι, καὶ οὐκ ἐξ ἐθνῶν ἀμαρτωλοί· ¹⁵ εἰδότες δὲ ὅτι οὐ δικαιοῦται ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ἔργων νόμου, ἔαν ¹⁶ μὴ διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐπιστεύσαμεν, ἵνα δικαιωθῶμεν ἐκ πίστεως χριστοῦ καὶ οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων νόμου, ὅτι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου οὐ δικαιωθήσεται πᾶσα σὰρξ. εἰ δὲ ζητοῦντες δικαιωθῆναι ἐν χριστῷ ¹⁷ εὐρέθημεν καὶ αὐτοὶ ἀμαρτωλοί, ἄρα χριστὸς ἀμαρτίας

¹ τλ.

only half a Jew, seek to make the Gentiles Jews? Or, why do you, who have hitherto been eating with Gentiles, now withdraw yourself to constrain them to conform?

ἀναγκάζεις, *compellest*.] That is to say, of Peter, his principle logically involved this, or his influence and example would be likely to effect it.

15—21. These words are the substance of a conversation between the two Apostles, of which one side only is narrated, and which soon passes off into the general subject of the Epistle. Verse 14. is the answer of St. Paul to Peter; what follows, is more like the Apostle musing or arguing with himself, with an indirect reference to the Galatians. As in Romans, iii. 1—8. it is impossible to determine how far, or at what point the Apostle is speaking to himself, how far he may be addressing another. Compare John iii. when the discourses of Christ with Nicodemus, and of John the Baptist, appear in the same way to mingle imperceptibly with the thoughts of the Evangelist. Compare also, 1 Cor. xi. 25.

15. Ἡμεῖς φύσει Ἰουδαῖοι, *We who are Jews by nature*.] St. Paul, as already remarked, is not in these words literally answering Peter, but putting himself in the position of one who was answering:—"We," he says, "who are not, according to our favourite phrase, sinners of the Gentiles, but natural-born Jews." Compare the common expression, *τελῶναι καὶ ἀμαρτωλοί*, Matt. ix. 10. 11. &c.; also Rom. ix. 30.—*ἔθνη τὰ μὴ διώκοντα δικαιοσύνην*.

For the construction we may supply *ἔσμεν*, or carry on the thought to *ἐπιστεύσαμεν*. According to the first explanation, we may translate as follows:—"We are Jews by birth, yet not ignorant that a man is justified by faith, and not by works." The ellipse is somewhat harsh, and may be avoided by adopting the other construction, which gives more point to the words, *καὶ οὐκ ἐξ ἐθνῶν ἀμαρτωλοί*. "We, who are not sinners of the Gentiles, and therefore, of course, needing redemption, but born Jews, the natural heirs of the kingdom of God; knowing, however (δὲ) that for the Jew as well as the Gentile, the way is not by works, but

after the manner of Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, how¹ compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?

- 15 We who are Jews by nature, and not sinners of
 16 the Gentiles, knowing that a man is not justified by
 the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus
 Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we
 might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not
 by the works of the law: for by the works of
 17 the law shall no flesh be justified. But if, while we
 seek to be justified in Christ, we ourselves also are
 found sinners, then is Christ the minister of sin.

¹ Why.

by faith. We too, I say, have believed on Christ that we may be justified by faith in Christ, and not by works of the law, for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified."

The verses that follow are extremely obscure. The connexion seems to require that the Apostle should say something which has a bearing on Peter's inconsistency. We Jews, he has said, are justified by Christ, and not by the law. You think he is going to drive the argument home by adding. But "we are not justified by Christ, if we conform to the law;" or in his own words "Behold, if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing." This is what we expect him to say, and what he does say, though wrapt up in obscurity from the peculiar view implied here, and more explicitly drawn out in the Epistle to the Romans, of the relation of sin and the law.

17—20. But if seeking to be jus-

tified in Christ, we, too, are found sinners as well as the Gentiles; that is, in other words, if we too fall back under the power of the law, is Christ the cause of this? is he the author of that law which is "the strength of sin," which "reviving we die"? Not so. It is we, not he, who are the ministers of sin; we make ourselves transgressors by imposing upon ourselves a law which makes us transgress. We build up what we pulled down. The law was but the negation of itself, the means to its own extinction, and the creation of a new life in us. But now the law that was dead is made alive again.

Had the thought of the law being death been placed first, there would have been no difficulty in understanding the Apostle's meaning, which clears up as we proceed. He is speaking from his own point of view, not from ours, or from that of his opponents. He cannot imagine

διάκονος. μὴ γένοιτο. εἰ γὰρ ἃ κατέλυσα, ταῦτα πάλιν 18
οἰκοδομῶ, παραβάτην ἑμαυτὸν συνιστάνω.¹ ἐγὼ γὰρ διὰ 19
νόμου νόμῳ ἀπέθανον, ἵνα θεῷ ζήσω. χριστῷ συνεσταύ- 20
ρωμαι. ζῶ δὲ οὐκέτι ἐγώ, ζῇ δὲ ἐν ἐμοὶ χριστός· ὁ δὲ νῦν
ζῶ ἐν σαρκί, ἐν πίστει ζῶ τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ χριστοῦ τοῦ

¹ συνίστημι.

any justified by works, without falling under the power of sin. "Whatsoever is not of faith, is sin," as he says in the Romans. And when men are in this sinful condition, was it Christ that brought them to it? Not Christ, but what they have added to Christ; for where there is no law, there is no transgression. They brought the transgression on themselves; they went to seek the law.

19. Three explanations are given of this verse:—(1.) "I through the law in a higher sense, became dead to the law in a lower;" or, "I through the law of the Spirit of life, became dead to the law of Moses" (comp. 1 Cor. ix. 21.:—μὴ ὦν ἄνομος θεοῦ ἀλλ' ἐννομος χριστοῦ); an interpretation which requires the word "law" to be taken in two different senses in the same passage, and of which it is no justification to say that in different passages the word *νόμος*, when helped by the connexion, may bear either. No one could imagine that the sentence, "I through the law to the law am dead," if translated out of, or into any language, would admit of the word law being taken in different senses.

(2.) The words may be taken as signifying—"the law itself has taught me to disregard the law;" the law itself was the school-master to bring me to Christ,

saying the same things respecting faith and forgiveness of sins. Such a way of explaining the passage would be confirmed by other places in which St. Paul seeks to base justification by faith, on the words of the law. Yet it is inadequate to the expression he here uses which, is far stronger: not, "I by the words of the law was taught that the words of the law were of no authority;" but, "I through the law was dead to the law."

(3.) It seems better to take the word *νόμος* in this passage, not for a written book, but for that power over the heart and conscience of which the Apostle speaks in the Romans, where he says:—"When the law came, sin revived, and I died." First let us consider the words διὰ νόμου ἀπέθανον, "I through the law was dead that I may live." The law had wrought in me the infinite consciousness of sin, and the sense that, do what I would, the fulfilment of its requirements was impossible. It was a state of death, but of death unto life. Now, the Apostle adds to this thought "through the law I died unto the law, that I may live unto God." (Compare the parallelism in Romans, "in that he died he died unto sin once, but in that he liveth he liveth unto God.") In this second relation ἀπέθανον is used in a different sense.

- 18 God forbid. For if I build again the things which
 19 I destroyed, I make myself a transgressor. For I
 through the law am dead to the law, that I might live
 20 unto God. I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I
 live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life
 which I now live in the flesh, I live by the faith of the

For as before it denoted the highest state of discord, the "paralysis of our moral nature," here in reference to *νόμῳ* it rather denotes insensibility to the law which has no more power over him than over a dead man.

It has been objected to the above explanation that too much use is made in it of the Epistle to the Romans, and especially that it supposes the doctrine of the seventh chapter of the Romans to have been everywhere and at all times present to the mind of the Apostle. That it was present in writing this passage, is, I think, shown by the words *διὰ νόμον νόμῳ ἀπέθανον* in which the whole is contained. The truth of an interpretation is sometimes tested by a comparison with other interpretations. What other interpretations of this passage are possible? First, here as in Rom. vi. the Apostle may be answering antinomian objections, and with this the general tone of the passage agrees, the fatal flaw being the want of connexion with Peter's speech; or, secondly, verse. 17 may be paraphrased as follows:—"If we believers in Christ maintain obedience to the law, and at the same time transgress it, is Christ the cause of this? No, not Christ, but ourselves." But here, though the sense of the words, *ἐνρέθημην καὶ αὐτοὶ ἀμαρτωλοί*, be easier, the

connexion with ver. 19. 20. again breaks down.

ἵνα θεῶ ζήσω.] He carries on the figure of a "living death." Himself, and his sins are like the body of death, but within that crucified body Christ lives as on the cross. (Comp. Rom. vii.)

20. Comparing this verse with the preceding, we trace three stages in the Christian state:—

- i. Death;
- ii. Death with Christ;
- iii. Christ living in us.

First we are one with Christ, and then Christ is put in our place. So far we are using the same language with the Apostle. At the next, stage a difference appears. We begin with figures of speech—sacrifice, ransom, lamb of God; and go on with logical determinations—finite, infinite, satisfaction, necessity in the nature of things. St. Paul also begins with figures of speech—life, death, the flesh; but passes on to the inward experience of the life of faith, and the consciousness of Christ dwelling in us.

ὁ δὲ νῦν ζῶ ἐν σαρκί.] Not as explained by some interpreters, "my present life in the Jews' religion, under this temporal dispensation of the law;" but more generally, "my present life in this world, I live in faith on the Son of God." Comp. 2 Cor. v. 6. 7.—"We walk by faith and not by sight."

ἀγαπήσαντός με καὶ παραδόντος ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ. οὐκ 21
 ἀθετῶ τὴν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ· εἰ γὰρ διὰ νόμου δικαιοσύνη,
 ἄρα χριστὸς δωρεὰν ἀπέθανεν.

This clause is not a limitation of what had gone before, but rather a realisation of it, as it is a recognition of his present imperfect state. He had said before:—"I am crucified with Christ; yet it is not I that live, but Christ that liveth in me." This is the lan-

guage of ecstasy, not the reality of this waking world. But as in the Romans, he speaks of those who are justified by faith, and have the first-fruits of the Spirit, as groaning within themselves, "waiting for the redemption of the body," so here, the remem-

- 21 Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me. I do not frustrate the grace of God; for if righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain.

brance comes back to him of his earthly and dependent being:—
“But the life I live now, so far as it is to be called life in this evil state, I live by faith in him who has done all things for me.”

21. I do not make void the grace of God, as I should do if I conformed to the law; for if there were righteousness by the law, Christ's death would have been of no use.

THE reasons for supposing the meeting of St. Paul with the Apostles at Jerusalem, mentioned in Chap ii., to be the same with that commonly called the Council, Acts, xv., are briefly the following:—

- i. The date of the meeting mentioned in Gal. ii. 1., which, whether we suppose it to have taken place fourteen or seventeen years after the conversion of St. Paul, agrees with the limits of time which the indefinite chronology of the Acts allows us to assign to the Council, but not with that of any other visit of St. Paul to Jerusalem.
- ii. The impossibility of placing the Council either before or after the meeting of the Apostles in the Galatians: before,—because St. Paul, in the enumeration of his journeys, must have referred to one which bore so directly on the question in dispute; after,—for the same reason, unless we suppose the council to have taken place so late as towards the end of the Apostle's stay at Ephesus, Acts, xviii. 19., xix. 41., which, again, is wholly inconsistent with the order of events in the Acts.
- iii. The improbability of a repetition of an event, in which so many of the circumstances are the same:—*e. g.*
 - (1.) Place in which the dispute originated.—Probably, Antioch. Comp. Acts, xv. 1.; Gal. ii. 12.
 - (2.) Subject.—Circumcision of the Gentiles.
 - (3.) Persons.—Paul, Barnabas, certain others, Acts, xv. 2.,—among whom, probably, Titus, who is nowhere mentioned in the Acts—James, Cephas.
 - (4.) Occasion.—“Men which came down from Judæa, and taught the brethren,” which has a degree of parallel with those who “came from James to Antioch,” in Gal. ii. 12.

iv. These similarities cannot be overbalanced by the supposed discrepancies, which are no more than :—

(1.) The publicity of the Council, compared with Gal. ii. 2.

(2.) The unbroken image of harmony presented by the narrative of the Acts, contrasted with the tone of Gal. ii. 2—6.;

especially when it is remembered that these very discrepancies are just of the kind that would be likely to arise between the letter of the Apostle himself and the narrative of a somewhat later date, which casts the veil of time over the differences of Apostles; and that the inconsistency of conduct is not greater than that which, in any case, we are compelled to attribute to Peter.

The discrepancies which occur elsewhere between the Epistles of St. Paul and the Acts of the Apostles, tend to impair the force of any argument from difference in the two accounts, while they leave the force of the argument from coincidences undiminished.

CHAP. III. IV.

THE Apostle has concluded his narrative, and the argument to which it gave birth. His thoughts return to the Galatians, whom he once more addresses with the same vehement emotion as at i. 6—10. He schools them, like children; he appeals to their experience; he bids them remember the hour of their conversion. Did they expect to go forward by going back to their former state? were the great effects which they had witnessed, produced by the works of the law or by the hearing of faith? As elsewhere, the word "faith" is the key-note of the argument which the Apostle, dropping his former emotion, steadily pursues to the end of the chapter. It may be divided into two heads, of which the promise to Abraham is the connecting link: the first, (1.) as in the fourth chapter of the Romans, relating to Abraham as the father of the faithful, whose faith, and that of his faithful children, is contrasted with the law, as blessing and cursing in the language of the law itself; and in the words of the promise to whom, the Apostle reads the acceptance, through faith, of all nations; the second head of argument, (2.) which commences with ver. 15. taking occasion from the words "unto thy seed," and dwelling again, as in the fourth chapter of the Romans, on the time at which the promise was made, which gave it a priority over the law, and setting forth the mediate, subordinate, and temporary character of the latter.

The undercurrent of these two chapters, as of the whole Epistle, is not argument, but feeling, which re-appears again at the ninth verse of the fourth chapter. The bearing of the previous passage had been to show that the state of those under the law was a kind of childhood or pupillage, from which Christ had redeemed us by being under the

law, as at ver. 13. of chapter iii. it was said, that he had "redeemed us from the curse of the law by being made a curse for us." On this text the Apostle proceeds to address them, contrasting their half heathen, half Jewish superstitions with the liberty of the sons of God. Then, for an instant, he pauses to speak of his personal relation to them. He was touched by the thought of it, especially when he remembered his own infirmities which seemed only to increase their affection for him. But how changed was all this! He will not accuse them of a wrong to himself (though he can find no other reason for it, but his own plain speaking), but simply beg of them to be at one with him again. He then briefly glances at the false teachers, their reception of whom he seems to attribute to a sort of ignorance of the world, and as if words out of the law must be better rhetoric to them than any that he could employ, once more harping on the instance of Abraham, he repeats the story of Isaac and Ishmael, the child of promise, and the child born after the flesh, and arguing in a manner more convincing and intelligible to his own age than to ours, as above from the letter of the text, so here from the connexion between Hagar and the land in which the law was given, he concludes, as he began, the chapter by associating the idea of bondage with the law.

ὦ ἀνόητοι Γαλάται, τίς ὑμᾶς ἐβάσκανεν¹, οἷς κατ' 3
ὀφθαλμοὺς Ἰησοῦς χριστὸς προεγράφη² ἐσταύρωμενος;
τοῦτο μόνον θέλω μαθεῖν ἀφ' ὑμῶν, ἐξ ἔργων νόμου τὸ 2
πνεῦμα ἐλάβετε, ἢ ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως; οὕτως ἀνόητοί ἐστε; 3
ἐναρξάμενοι πνεύματι νῦν σαρκὶ ἐπιτελείσθε; τοσαῦτα 4

¹ Add τῇ ἀληθείᾳ μὴ πείθεσθαι.

² Add ἐν ὑμῖν.

III. From the statement of facts, the Apostle proceeded, at the close of the last chapter, to a brief summary of the doctrine which he preached, and now passes on to make a personal appeal to his Galatian converts. In the 6th verse he returns to the doctrine, which is confirmed, as in the Romans, by the case of Abraham, and deduced by various arguments from the Old Testament Scriptures. From the 17th verse to the end of the previous chapter, he has been covertly arguing with the Galatians; comp. Rom. ii. 1—17. In the 20th verse, his feelings warm, as he describes the hidden life of Christ in the soul; the fire kindles with the remembrance, that the Galatian converts had seen and known the same things, and had had Christ crucified evidently set before them, until, at last, he bursts forth upon them with the words:—O senseless Galatians! who hath bewitched you, who had such lively experience of the truth which now with such levity ye throw aside? Shall the latter end forget the beginning? Did you receive, or God give, that new spirit by works of the law? It was with you, as with Abraham, who believed and was justified."

1. τίς ὑμᾶς ἐβάσκανεν; *who hath bewitched you?*

[τῇ ἀληθείᾳ μὴ πείθεσθαι, are omitted by the oldest manuscripts, as well as by all recent editors, and have probably crept in from ver. 7.]

οἷς κατ' ὀφθαλμούς, *before, &c.* "Before whose eyes Christ crucified, as in a picture, was set." For an instance of the same pictorial language comp. 2 Cor. iii. 18.: — τὴν δόξαν κυρίου καταπ-
τριζόμενοι, τὴν αὐτὴν εἰκόνα μετα-
μορφούμεθα.

[ἐν ὑμῖν is omitted by A. B. C., and in the late editions. If retained, it may be taken: — (1.) with προεγράφη, and is then an emphatic repetition of οἷς; or, (2.) with ἐσταυρωμένος, in the latter case better in the sense of "in you" than "among you," in the same way that at ch. ii. ver. 20. it was said ζῇ ἐν ἐμοὶ χριστός.]

προεγράφη, not "written down beforehand," but "pictured before;" πρό, as is confirmed by the the words κατ' ὀφθαλμούς, being used of place, and not of time. No other instance occurs of the word being taken in this sense, which is, nevertheless, required by the context; and is supported by the analogy of προέθετο, Rom. iii. 25. The Apostle appears to have used the word in what may be termed an etymological meaning; that is, he resolved the compound προγράφειν into the simple words of which it is made up.

- 3 O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you¹, before
 whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth
 2 crucified among you ? This only would I learn of you,
 Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by
 3 the hearing of faith ? Are ye so foolish ? having begun
 in the Spirit, are ye now made perfect by the flesh ?
 4 have ye suffered so many things in vain ? if indeed * it

¹ Add that ye should not obey the truth.

The words of the text refer, partly to the plainness with which St. Paul preached to them Christ crucified ; partly to the liveliness with which they received the image, beholding, as in a picture, the sufferings of Christ.

2. Let me ask you one question : I will put the matter to one test, Was it of works or of faith that you received the Spirit ?

What does St. Paul mean by receiving the Spirit ? not merely a moral change or renewal of the heart, but that sudden conversion which is described in the Acts as “the Holy Ghost falling upon them, as upon us at the beginning.” He appeals in them to what he felt in himself to be the firmest ground of faith — inward experience, dating from that period “when he saw the Lord.”

ἐσταυρωμένος] has an echo of *συνεσταύρωμαι* in ii. 20. Comp. 1 Cor. i. 23., ii. 2.

ἐναρξάμενοι πνεύματι.] Taking up the words of the two previous verses, *ἀνόητοι, πνεύματι*, as his manner is, the Apostle adds :— “Having begun in the Spirit, are ye now ending in the flesh ?” The opposition here is not between holiness and uncleanness, or good and evil generally, but between the Gospel

and the law. *σάρξ* is used for that part of man which is the seat of the law in its worst sense, as affording an occasion for sin. It is applied to the Mosaic dispensation :—(1.) in the general sense of “external ;” (2.) as propagated by fleshly descent ; (3.) as sealed by the mark of circumcision in the flesh.

ἀκοὴ πίστεως.] The first act of faith whereby a man became a Christian, was bound up with the word of the preacher :— “So, then, faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God,” Rom. x. 17. *ἀκοὴ πίστεως* = the hearing that goes along with faith : the two words form a defective antithesis to *ἐργων νόμον*.

τοσαῦτα ἐπάθετε εἰκῇ ;] (1.) “Did ye suffer all those persecutions in vain ?” or, (2.) “Had you all these experiences in vain ?” The latter is more agreeable to the context and to the general spirit of St. Paul’s teaching, as well as to the few facts which we gather respecting the Galatian Church, which had, probably, not yet suffered persecution. Even were this otherwise, it is unlike the noble spirit of the Apostle to say :— “Have you thrown away

ἐπάθετε εἰκῇ; εἰ γε καὶ εἰκῇ. ὁ οὖν ἐπιχορηγῶν ὑμῖν τὸ 5
 πνεῦμα καὶ ἐνεργῶν δυνάμεις ἐν ὑμῖν ἐξ ἔργων νόμου ἢ
 ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως; καθὼς Ἀβραὰμ ἐπίστευσεν τῷ θεῷ, 6
 καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην. γινώσκετε ἄρα ὅτι 7
 οἱ ἐκ πίστεως οὗτοι¹ υἱοὶ εἰσιν Ἀβραὰμ. προῖδούσα δὲ 8
 ἡ γραφὴ ὅτι ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοὶ τὰ ἔθνη ὁ θεός, προενηγ-
 γελίστατο τῷ Ἀβραὰμ ὅτι ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν σοὶ
 πάντα τὰ ἔθνη. ὥστε οἱ ἐκ πίστεως εὐλογοῦνται σὺν 9
 τῷ πιστῷ Ἀβραάμ. ὅσοι γὰρ ἐξ ἔργων νόμου εἰσίν, 10
 ὑπὸ κατάραν εἰσίν. γέγραπται γὰρ ὅτι² ἐπικατάρατος

¹ εἰσιν υἱοί.² Om. ὅτι.

the fruits of all those persecutions?" The Apostle adds a qualification: — εἰ γε καὶ εἰκῇ, "Have you had all these experiences in vain? if, indeed, which I cannot bear to think, it be in vain;" not, "if it be only and not worse than in vain," which, if it suit the sense, is not consistent with the words.

5. In remembrance of the time of your conversion, I say then again, did He who supplied you the Spirit, and gave you miraculous powers, work by the deeds of the law or by the hearing of faith?

From this verse onward, commencing at εἰ γε καὶ εἰκῇ, the Apostle changes his tone, and reasons with the Galatians, instead of rebuking them. Comp. for a similar change, iv. 21.

6. "It was with you," or, "Was it not with you even as with Abraham, who believed God, and it was counted to him for righteousness?" The Apostle returns to the "locus classicus" in the Old Testament, on which he founded his doctrine.

Nothing could be more striking

to the Judaizers, to whom the words, "righteousness by faith," were an abomination in the mouth of the Gentile Apostle, than to find them applied in the books of Moses themselves to the father of the Jewish race. And yet the Judaizers might have retorted, that the words of the Old Testament respecting Abraham, were used by the Apostle in a wider sense than they originally bore.

The force of the whole argument which follows, turns upon the entire opposition of the law and faith. As blessing is to cursing, so is faith to the law. The just shall live by faith, but cursed is every one that abideth not in all things written in the book of the law. At the height of the opposition Christ comes in to mediate between them, that by taking upon Himself the curse, it may become a blessing. Comp. Rom. viii. 3.

7. The only conclusion (ἄρα) from the case of Abraham is, that they which are of faith, these I say, and not the others, are the sons of Abraham.

5 be in vain. HE therefore that ministereth to you the Spirit, and worketh miracles among you, doeth he it by
6 the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith? Even as Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him
7 for righteousness. Know ye therefore that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham.
8 And the scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the Gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed.
9 So then they which be of faith are blessed with the*
10 faithful Abraham. For as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse: for it is written, that

8, 9. As in 1 Cor. ix. 8, 9, 10. a providential intention is attributed to the words of the Old Testament. Compare Rom. iv. 3., *τί γὰρ ἡ γραφή λέγει*; as here speaking of Abraham.

8. *προϊδοῦσα δέ.*] *δέ* is slightly adversative: but what the Scripture meant, though it may not appear at first sight, is the salvation of the Gentiles through faith. The words of the quotation as they occur in the LXX. are *εὐλογηθήσονται ἐν σοὶ πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς*,—*πάντα τὰ ἔθνη* being introduced from the repetition of the same promise in Gen. xviii.

18. *ἐν σοὶ* means, "in thee," by anticipation; in the original passage it has the sense, "by thee;" that is, the form of their blessing shall be, by thy name. "The Lord bless thee, as He blessed Abraham and his descendants." *ἔθνη* has also received a change of meaning, referring in Genesis to the nations of the world in general; but here (compare ver. 14.) confined by St. Paul to the heathen, who are to be saved by

faith. The general meaning is as follows:—"It was not a mere accident that it was said, in thee shall all the Gentiles be blessed, but because Abraham was justified by faith, as the Gentiles were to be justified by faith."

9. So then, the faithful are blessed with the father of the faithful; a reduplication of ver. 7. For when the term "blessing" is used, it cannot refer to those who are under the law, and therefore under a curse; the law cannot be meant, for the law itself denounces this curse against all who disobey it.

10. *ἐπικατάρατος πᾶς ὅς.*] These words are quoted from Deut. xxvii. 26., with a slight verbal alteration from the LXX. The word *πᾶσι* is omitted in the Hebrew text. In some way or other a curse comes upon those who disobey the law. Is this for their imperfect obedience, or because it was impossible that they should obey at all? If we adopt the first interpretation, that every man was under the

πᾶς ὃς οὐκ ἐμμένει ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς γεγραμμένοις ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νόμου, τοῦ ποιῆσαι αὐτά. ὅτι δὲ ἐν νόμῳ 11 οὐδεὶς δικαιоῦται παρὰ τῷ θεῷ δῆλον, ὅτι Ὁ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται, ὁ δὲ νόμος οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ πίστεως, ἀλλ' 12 Ὁ ποιήσας αὐτὰ¹ ζήσεται ἐν αὐτοῖς. χριστὸς ἡμᾶς 13 ἐξηγόρασεν ἐκ τῆς κατάρας τοῦ νόμου, γενόμενος ὑπὲρ

¹ κνηρωπος.

curse, because none could perfectly obey the law; yet, on the other hand, it may be urged, that an imperfect obedience would tend to mitigate the curse. The law could not be opposed to the Gospel, as the curse to the blessing, were it only a defective good. There is no trace in St. Paul of the belief that all human virtue was equally defective, and equally fell short of the Divine requirement. The second of the two interpretations is, therefore, the true one. St. Paul does not mean that men partially fulfilled the law, but that they could not fulfil it at all. Like the notion of fate or necessity, it did but produce "a fearful looking for of judgment;" as the Apostle says in Rom. iv. 15.:—"The law worketh wrath."

11. And as before we proved negatively, that no man could be justified by the law, because no man could fulfil all the commandments of the law, so now we prove the same thing positively, because there is another way appointed whereby men are to have life,—the way of faith. As the prophet Habakkuk says—"The just shall live by faith."

12. δέ is adversative to the suppressed thought suggested by the previous verse, that it was possible to abide in all things written in the book of the law. For the

question, whether in the quotation (from Habak. ii. 4.) the words ἐκ πίστεως are to be taken with ὁ δίκαιος, or with ζήσεται, see on Rom. i. 17.

But the law uses a very different language:—"He that doeth the commandments shall live in them." Lev. xviii. 5.; quoted also in Rom. x. 5.

Thus far, the Apostle has carried out the antithesis of the law and faith. With the faith of Abraham went a blessing; with the law, a curse, by the confession of the law itself. The one said, "The just shall live by faith;" the other, "He shall live who does all that is written in the book of the law." The curse was endured by Christ, that it might not be endured by us; (the law itself, in saying "Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree," justifies this statement;) the final purpose being, that the blessing of Abraham might reach the Gentiles, and that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith.

13. χριστὸς...κατάρα.] The particular expression, "Christ became a curse for us who were under the curse of the law," may be best considered as a particular instance of a class. In the Scriptural doctrine of the atonement, the believer is one with Christ, until at length Christ takes the be-

- every one is cursed¹ who continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them.
- 11 But that no man is justified by the law in the sight of God, it is evident: for, The just shall live by faith.
- 12 But * the law is not of faith: but he² that doeth them
- 13 shall live in them. Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us; forasmuch

¹ Cursed is every one.² The man.

liever's place, and all that the Christian is, and all that he was or might have been, are transferred to Christ. Thus any new point of view in which the sin, or misery, or infirmity of man is regarded, belongs not to man, but to Christ, as the firstborn among many brethren, partaking of the common infirmity of human nature. The most extreme example of this is in the Gospels, where the miracles by which Christ healed the sick are considered as a transfer of our infirmities to himself. Matt. viii. 17.

χριστὸς ἡμᾶς ἐξηγόρασεν.] A further proof that we cannot be justified by the law is, that the curse of the law is what Christ redeemed us from. We were like captives, and Christ paid the penalty for us.

Do these words refer to the Jew only, or also to the Gentile? Primarily, to the Jew; in a degree also to the Gentile. By the same act the burden is taken off the Jew, and a way is laid open to the Gentile. But the same figure is not equally applicable to both. The Gentile, too, has his law on the conscience, his burden of sin; but this is a momentary parallel into which he is brought with the Jew. The general conception of his previous state is rather

expressed by the words:—"Ye were carried away by dumb idols, even as ye were led." He needs salvation to be extended to him, but it is in a different form. It is true, however, that the Apostle regards the case of Jew and Gentile as in the closest connexion; they alternate with each other, and are almost identical in several passages of his Epistles. As in Rom. ii. iii. the same eye of the soul is turned upon both. As in Rom. iv. the distinction of Jew and Gentile is lost in the common designation of children of the faith of Abraham. Hence, though in ver. 13. he uses the words, "redeemed us from the curse of the law," which are only applicable to Jews, he passes on in the latter clause of ver. 14. to include in one both Jew and Gentile.

The Jew was a captive, and Christ called him into the liberty of the sons of God. The Gentile is a partaker of the same heritage.

But how, it may be asked, was this effected by Christ being a curse for him? To answer this question we must distinguish between the Spirit and the letter, the inward meaning and the figure of the Jewish law.

(1.) The inward meaning is that Christ's teaching and life

ἡμῶν κατάρρα, ὅτι γέγραπται¹ Ἐπικατάρρατος πᾶς ὁ κρε-
 μάμενος ἐπὶ ξύλου, ἵνα εἰς τὰ ἔθνη ἡ εὐλογία τοῦ¹⁴
 Ἀβραὰμ γένηται ἐν χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, ἵνα τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν
 τοῦ πνεύματος λάβωμεν διὰ τῆς πίστεως.

Ἀδελφοί, κατὰ ἄνθρωπον λέγω. ὁμως ἀνθρώπου κε-¹⁵
 κυρωμένην διαθήκην οὐδεὶς ἀθετεῖ ἢ ἐπιδιατάσσεται. τῷ

¹ γέγραπται γάρ.

and death drew men to him, until they were taken out of themselves, and in all their thoughts and actions became one with Him.

(2.) That His life seemed naturally to bring upon Him the penalty of the Jewish law:—
 "We have a law, and by our law he ought to die."

(3.) That at the same time that his death was a fulfilment of the law, it was also the end of the law. He endured the law and did away with the law at once.

(4.) Mankind, contrasting the image of his life, and the requirement of the law, feel that they are placed above the law, and so escape with him from its burden.

To the figure must be assigned:—

(1.) The notion of a ransom.

(2.) As nearly connected with this, the notion of Christ being a sacrifice by which, as the victim on the altar, God is propitiated.

ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν,] on our behalf, but passing into the sense of "instead of," like the English for us, where, as in this passage, the latter meaning is assisted by the context. The Apostle again confirms his view by a passage from the Old Testament, which is cited from the LXX. with a slight verbal difference; St. Paul reading ἐπικατάρρατος πᾶς, instead of καταραμένος ὑπὸ θεοῦ πᾶς, Deut. xxi. 23. In its original connexion it refers to the body of

the criminal, which was not to be left hanging after the evening, lest the earth should be polluted by the corse. This St. Paul transfers to Christ. The abhorred death of the cross which the Romans inflicted on their slaves, recalled to his mind the curse of the Jewish law.

It may, on the other hand, be urged, that the curse in the book of the law does not refer to the mere accidental circumstance of hanging on a tree, but to the crime which was the occasion of it. But in that mixed moral and ceremonial dispensation, this is not certain; and even if it were, all we can do in this and similar passages is to trace the figure in the Apostle's mind, without attempting to reduce it to our previous notions of the meaning of the Old Testament. Compare Acts, v. 30., "Whom ye slew and hanged on a tree;" Acts, x. 39., "Whom they slew and hanged on a tree;" 1 Peter, ii. 24., "Who himself bore our sins, in his own body, on a tree;" where the same thought of the curse resting on every one who was hanged on a tree, seems to pass before the writer's mind.

14. ἵνα εἰς τὰ ἔθνη ἡ εὐλογία τοῦ Ἀβραάμ.] Christ did away the law, and so left free passage for the blessing of Abraham, through faith to extend, not to the Jews only, but to all man-

¹as it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a
14 tree: that the blessing of Abraham might come on the
Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive
the promise of the Spirit through faith.

15 Brethren, I speak after the manner of men; Though it
be but a man's covenant, yet if it be confirmed, no man

¹ For.

kind. These words have an immediate reference to what was said above, ver. 7., that they that are of faith are the sons of Abraham, and that in him all nations of the earth shall be blessed.

ἵνα τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πνεύματος λάβωμεν, *that we may receive, &c.*] Does St. Paul, in this clause, refer to Jews only, or to Gentiles also? Here as at ver. 13. the first person covertly includes both;—the Apostle and his converts. The object of Christ's redeeming men from the curse of the law was twofold:—(1.) that the Gentiles might be accepted; and (2.) that Jews, as well as Gentiles, might be justified by faith. These two, however, are not opposed; in this passage the first is looked upon as the condition of the latter. Not only was it the design of the Gospel that the Jews should be justified by faith, that the Gentiles might be admitted; but conversely, that the Gentiles should be admitted, that the Jews might be justified by faith. Compare Rom. xi. This is, however, veiled by the use of the plural λάβωμεν, an ambiguity which we are the more justified in assuming here, as a similar one occurs in two other passages where the same subject is treated of, Rom. iv. 12., xv. 9.; also, Rom. iii. 19, 20.; Gal. iv. 24.

15. Ἀδελφοί, *Brethren.*] The

Apostle continues to soften his tone.

κατὰ ἄνθρωπον λέγω, *I speak after the manner of men.*] The expression is used with various shades of meaning; sometimes, as in Rom. iii. 5., as a sort of apology for some supposition about Divine things; sometimes, in the sense of "It is I who say, and not the Lord;" sometimes simply "I speak after the manner of men," or "I use a human figure." To which may be added in this passage, the notion of what we should term an *a fortiori* argument from human to Divine things: "I speak as a man; if this is true in human things, how much more in Divine?"

ὅμως implies an opposition to the Divine covenant of which he is about to speak. "I speak as a man; yet in the case of a human covenant, when it has been confirmed it holds, that no one sets it aside or adds to it."

κεκυρωμένην διαθήκην.] Comp. Hebr. vi. 16, 17.:—"For men verily swear by the greater, and an oath for confirmation is to them an end of all strife. Wherein God, willing more abundantly to show unto the heirs of promise the immutability of his counsel confirmed it by an oath."

διαθήκην,] either covenant or testament. The Gospel may be said to be (1.) a testament in reference to the death of Christ, who

δὲ Ἀβραὰμ ἐρρέθησαν αἱ ἐπαγγελίαι, καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ. οὐ λέγει Καὶ τοῖς σπέρμασιν, ὡς ἐπὶ πολλῶν, 16 ἀλλ' ὡς ἐφ' ἑνὸς Καὶ τῷ σπέρματί σου, ὃς ἐστὶν χριστός. τοῦτο δὲ λέγω. διαθήκην προκεκυρωμένην ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ¹ ὁ μετὰ τετρακόσια² καὶ τριάκοντα ἔτη γεγονώς 17

¹ Add εἰς χριστόν.² μετὰ ἑτη τετρακ.

bequeathed it to us as a legacy, as in the argument in Heb. ix. 17., where a testament is, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator; or, (2.) a covenant, in contrast with the law, and in accordance with the analogy of the covenants made with the patriarchs, as in this passage, and in Hebr. viii. 7., &c.

[ἐπιδιατίσσειν] is intended to indicate that the law was not, as the Jew might have said, an addition to the covenant, for there could be no addition to it.

A general view of the passage that follows will assist in the explanation of the several verses. As in the Romans, the Apostle has quoted the case of Abraham, who was justified by faith, and received also the universal promise that "in him all nations of the earth should be blessed." This is a figure of the Gospel dispensation, or rather it is the very Gospel "which Paul preached among the Gentiles." Two thousand years have passed away, and the meaning of the promise to Abraham is just coming to light. But here the thought arises in the Apostle's mind—"There has been a long interval; the law came between." To answer this objection, as at the commencement of the seventh chapter of the Romans, he brings forward an illustration:—Human covenants are binding for ever; you

cannot alter them, or add to them. How much more the covenant of Him with whom a thousand years are as one day, and one day as a thousand years? But the Jew would say, the covenant was but the beginning of the law; as we might say in a figure, the angel who talked with Abraham, was lost in the brightness of Mount Sinai. It is this point of view that the Apostle seeks to invert. According to him the covenant was to remain, the law to pass away. In the very words in which the covenant was given, "not unto seeds as of many, but as of one," was contained an intimation that it referred to Christ. It was in force 430 years. Can we suppose that it was superseded by the law? Rather the law and the promise are opposed to each other, as the law and faith, and it was through the promise that God gave the gift to Abraham. Then what shall we say of the law? It was an accident, an interpolation, an addition, designed not to do men good, but to make them conscious of evil, and in every thing showing its transitory and inferior nature. Is it then opposed to the promises? Not so. It had right, if it had had might; it had the idea of righteousness, if it had had the power to give life. But it was a law of condemnation only, the import of

disannulleth, or addeth thereto. Now to Abraham and
 16 his seed were the promises made. He saith not, and to
 seeds, as of many; but as of one, and to thy seed, which
 is Christ. And this I say; * the covenant, that was
 17 confirmed before of God¹ the law, which was four
 hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it

¹ Add in Christ.

which to us is that it made us capable of the promise. While it lasted we were shut up, as it were, in prison, waiting for the coming revelation. ¶“So that the law was our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ;” and was itself done away when Christ came.

16. τῷ δὲ Ἀβραάμ ἐρρέθησαν αἱ ἐπαγγελίαι.] Now to Abraham who, as we say, was justified by faith, the promises were made. Observe, that in making the promise he uses the singular number. “For in Isaac shall thy seed be called.” [It is to this passage Gen. xxi. 12., which is also quoted in Heb. xi. 18., the Apostle is probably referring.] Is this a mere accident? or saith he it not rather for our sakes, meaning Christ?

δέ, which is repeated in ver. 17., as the Apostle draws nearer to the point of his argument, is adversative to what has preceded:—“Human covenants are irreversible; but the case which I am about to put is of a Divine covenant,” which the Apostle proceeds to explain, and loses the antithesis in the length of the narrative. The argument of this verse reminds us that St. Paul was a Hebrew of the Hebrews, brought up at the feet of Gamaliel, interpreting the Scriptures after the manner of his time. Compare, for

a similar mode of interpretation, Gal. iv. 25.; 1 Cor. ix. 9., x. 4. The word translated “seed” may obviously have a collective as well as an individual sense, though without great violence to the language we cannot assign a similar collective meaning to the name of Christ, however close may be the connexion between Him and the Church, “which is his body.” The argument is thrown in by the way, and breaks the connexion of ver. 16. and 17. It is, however, subsidiary to the Apostle’s main object, which is to prove the identity of the law and the promise.

17. τοῦτο δὲ λέγω, and this I say.] In these words St. Paul returns to the proof, which he commenced in ver. 15.

μετὰ τετρακόσια καὶ τριάκοντα ἔτη, four hundred and thirty years after.] The law which was given so long after, could not do away with the promise.

There is a well known chronological difficulty in these words, connected with a similar chronological difficulty in the Old Testament, respecting the sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt. In the books of Genesis and Exodus the period of 430 years (Ex. xii. 40.), or in round numbers, 400 years (Gen. xv. 13., quoted in the Acts, vii. 6.), is assigned, not

νόμος οὐκ ἀκυροῖ εἰς τὸ καταργῆσαι τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν.
 εἰ γὰρ ἐκ νόμου ἡ κληρονομία, οὐκέτι ἐξ ἐπαγγελίας· 18
 τῷ δὲ Ἀβραὰμ δι' ἐπαγγελίας κεχάρισται ὁ θεός. τί 19
 οὖν ὁ νόμος; τῶν παραβάσεων χάριν προσετέθη, ἄχρις
 οὗ ἔλθῃ τὸ σπέρμα ᾧ ἐπηγγέλται, διαταγείς δι' ἀγγέλων

to the interval between the promise to Abraham, and the giving of the law, but to the actual sojourn of the children of Israel in Egypt. It is found on examination of the genealogies, however, that in some lines, as, for example, that of Moses himself, the whole time of 400 years comprises only three generations; and hence it has been argued, that the call of Abraham is the true limit of the period in question; and laborious calculations have been entered into to show that, in the course of two centuries, the children of Israel might possibly have increased from Jacob and his sons to several hundred thousands.

If these and similar difficulties could be removed, we should only have escaped an inaccuracy in the New Testament, by introducing a contradiction into the Old. That St. Paul is not quoting from any independent tradition is plain from his giving the exact number of Exodus, xii. 40. It is also clear, that in the narrative of Exodus this number refers to the actual time of servitude, and not to the interval between the promise and the law. But the Apostle has so applied it. He takes 430, the years of servitude mentioned in the Old Testament, for a period longer than 430 years, that is, for the whole time from Abraham to Moses.

18. εἰ γὰρ ἐκ νόμου ἡ κληρονομία.] The law cannot have superseded the covenant; for if it had, the

inheritance would cease to be attached to the promise (for the promise and the law exclude each other); but it was through the promise that God gave it to Abraham.

St. Paul refuses to look upon the law as a further fulfilment of the promise. *That* is not his point of view. He regards the law and the promise as opposed, just as the law and the Gospel; or rather, the promise being through faith, he regards the Gospel as identical with the promise. Compare *suprà*, the word *προεπηγγέλισατο*, ver. 8. The promise is a *προεναγγέλιον*.

19. τί οὖν ὁ νόμος;] The first impression on reading this verse is, that the Apostle meant to say that the law was added to restrain men from transgressions, in the interval of time between the promise and the coming of Christ. According to this view, the law would be regarded as the principle of order in the world, designed to keep men from utterly corrupting themselves, and giving them a moral preparation for the revelation which was to follow. Such a view is consistent with itself, and may be thought to derive confirmation from ver. 24.: "The law was our school-master to bring us to Christ." Yet the meaning of St. Paul, if interpreted by himself, that is by such passages as Rom. vii. 7—27., iii. 20., probably was, not that the law was added to restrain

- 18 should make the promise of none effect. For if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise: but
 19 God gave it to Abraham by promise. Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made; and it was ordained by angels in the hand of a

transgressions, but that the law was added to produce transgressions, or at least to give men that consciousness of sin which makes sin to be what it is, "for where there is no law there is no transgression," and "the strength of the sin is the law." The law, it must be remembered, is not with St. Paul a principle of good, but an abstract good. It would attribute too much power to the law to suppose that it could restrain men from sin. "By the deeds of the law," as the Apostle says in the Epistle to the Romans, "shall no flesh be justified, for by the law is the knowledge of sin." In other words, justification is the very opposite of that knowledge of sin which is by the law. In the language of the Epistle to the Romans, it might be said that the law was added to the covenant "that transgression might abound;" the other side of this doctrine is given in Rom. v. 20., "that grace might yet more abound."

One further point of view we must not lose sight of in the consideration of this question; that is, the near connexion of the final cause with the result in the Apostle's mind. The whole doctrine of righteousness by faith may be said to be based in a certain sense on fact, on two great facts especially; the conversion of the Apostle himself, and the conversion

of the Gentiles. So in this case, what St. Paul saw to be the fact, he also considered as the purpose of God. "Known unto God are all his works from the beginning." It was the fact that the law had increased sin, and therefore he regarded it as given for this purpose τῶν παραβάσεων χάριν.

ᾧ ἐπήγγελται.] Comp. above, "He saith not unto seeds as of many; but as of one...which is Christ."

διαταγείς δι' ἀγγέλων, *ordained of angels.*] There is no mention in the Old Testament of the law being given by angels, with the exception of a remote allusion in Deut. xxxiii. 2., "The Lord came from Sinai; he came with ten thousand of his saints." It was slowly and gradually, and as many have thought, not until the Babylonish captivity, that the angel of his presence in the Pentateuch, the 'angel of the Lord in the Books of Kings and Chronicles, and the covering cherubim of the prophets expanded into a multitude of the heavenly host, with distinct names and personalities. The word διαταγείς here, as the word διαταγή in Acts, vii. 53. "Who have received the law at the disposition of angels, and have not kept it,"—refers rather to the administration than to the giving of the law. As in Hebr. ii. 2., the law being in the disposition

ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτου· ὁ δὲ μεσίτης ἐνὸς οὐκ ἔστιν, ὁ δὲ 20
θεὸς εἰς ἐστίν. ὁ οὖν νόμος κατὰ τῶν ἐπαγγελιῶν [τοῦ 21

of angels, is contrasted with the Gospel, which is a revelation of a higher kind.

ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτου.] Either Moses or the high priest, or in general the priest or prophet who stood between God and the people.

Before entering on the discussion of this passage which has received 430 interpretations, it will be well for us to ascertain the drift of the verse before and after, which give almost the sole key we possess to the meaning of the disputed words. We shall thus only have to supply the connecting link, instead of reasoning upon the ambiguous text itself.

We will first begin by considering an opposite view of the connexion to that implied in the note on ver. 19. The object it may be urged of the words *διαταγείς δι' ἀγγέλων ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτου* is, not to depreciate the law in comparison of the Gospel, but rather to express its Divine character as a subordinate and intermediate dispensation. "The law was given because of transgressions," i. e., as before explained, to produce transgressions; and it was kept in the administration of angels, and one was appointed to stand between God and the people. The figure of angels, it might be said, belongs rather to the pomp and array of the law, and could not naturally be urged as an argument of depreciation. This is true; and may be further confirmed by Acts, vii. 53., and yet is sufficiently answered by the context and the parallel of Hebr. ii. 2.

If we go backwards from ver. 21., "Is the law then against the promises of God? God forbid:" it is plain from these words, that something has been said which implies a depreciation of the law. It would be neither good sense, nor agreeable to the manner of St. Paul to say, Whereunto serveth the law? It was added because of transgressions, and was firmly established and appointed by angels, and in the hands of a mediator, and a mediator we may explain to be, &c. Is the law then against the promises of God? There has been nothing in the previous verse which indicated, or could be imagined to indicate that it was. There would be a want of point in such a way of writing. It would be guarding against an inference that could not possibly arise. The view here taken, that there must have been a previous depreciation, is still further strengthened by a comparison of a parallel passage in Rom. vii. 6, 7., where the Apostle suddenly bursts out with the words, "What shall we say then, is the law sin? God forbid," as if to counteract and anticipate the effect of what he had said immediately before. "The motions of sins which were by this law, did work in our members."

Thus far we are led to suppose that the enigmatical verse 20. must form an antithesis to ver. 21. Such an interpretation we shall be able to put upon it, if we paraphrase ver. 19. as follows:—"The law was added not so much for the removal of sin, as to call

20 mediator. Now a mediator is not a mediator of one,
21 but God is one. Is the law then against the promises of

it into existence, and (but) it was in the appointment of angels, not of God himself, and did not admit of an immediate approach to him." (The particle *δέ* carries on the opposition of the law and the promise, which preceded.) It has been said that such an interpretation does not agree with the words *διαταγείς δι' ἀγγέλων*, which could not, as was observed above, be intended to depreciate the law, but rather to magnify its pomp and circumstance. Admitting this, which may or may not be so, there is no difficulty in supposing that St. Paul might, in one point of view, intend to depreciate the law, while, in another, he may have glorified it; at any rate so far as to use respecting it an expression familiar to the minds of the Jews; as in 2 Cor. iii. 6. he recognises the law as the ministration of death, and yet acknowledges its glory. It is characteristic of St. Paul, even where he is making towards a point, to insert clauses which are beside his point.

We have now to seek for a suitable interpretation of verse 20., of which two principal conditions may be laid down:—(1.) that it should agree with the connexion; and (2.) that it should admit of the word *εἷς* being taken in the same sense in both members of the sentence. The following combines both these conditions; if it seem obscure, it must be remembered that in a writer at once so subtle and abrupt as St. Paul, obscurity is not a strong ground of objection:—

The Apostle is contrasting the law, which had a mediator, with the Gospel, which was an open access to God. He says the law was in the hands of a mediator. Now, a mediator implies two persons—duality, mediation;—or the principle of a mediator, is not unity, but mediation; but in God is no mediation—he is one:—"Hear, O Israel," as the law said, "the Lord your God is one God." Neither need we exclude the further idea which is rather implied than expressed; God is one and the same to all—"there is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free." How far this further thought, which is distinctly expressed in ver. 28., may be contained in the words, *ὁ δὲ θεὸς εἷς ἐστίν*, is not clear; at any rate, the notion of the unity of the human race lay very near in the Apostle's mind to that of the unity of God. Compare Acts, xvii. 26. Out of this seems to flow another allusion, hardly conscious, yet latent in the Apostle's mind, to the unity of man with God which is also partly expressed in the latter half of verse 28.:—"Ye are all one in Christ Jesus." (Comp. also ver. 26.: "For ye are all the sons of God through faith in Christ Jesus.") Thus in addition to the primary meaning of the words, "Now a mediator implies mediation, but there is no mediation in God," we arrive at three secondary ones:—(1.) the reference to the Old Testament; (2.) the allusion to the unity of man to whom God is one and alike; (3.) to the unity of man with God, which

θεοῦ]; μὴ γένοιτο. εἰ γὰρ ἐδόθη νόμος ὁ δυνάμενος
ζωοποιῆσαι, ὧντως ἐκ νόμου¹ ἂν ᾦν ἡ δικαιοσύνη· ἀλλὰ 22
συνέκλεισεν ἡ γραφή τὰ πάντα ὑφ' ἁμαρτίαν, ἵνα ἡ ἐπ-
αγγελία ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ δοθῇ τοῖς πιστεύ-
ουσιν. πρὸ τοῦ δὲ ἐλθεῖν τὴν πίστιν ὑπὸ νόμον ἐφρου- 23

¹ ἂν ἐκ νόμου.

no less than the previous allusion is inconsistent with the mediatorial and exclusive character of the Jewish law. These meanings may seem complex, but it may be observed: (1.) they are all in harmony with the spirit of the passage; (2.) they agree with the manner of the age; (3.) they relate to a verse in the Old Testament, which more than any other was likely to be viewed in different lights and to receive a variety of meanings.

It has been already admitted that the sense assigned to ἐνός οὐκ ἔστιν is not obvious. To test it fairly we may compare another explanation. Verse 20. has been sometimes regarded as meaning,—“Now a mediator implies two parties, and God is one of those parties.” The mediator is ever standing between God and the people. The objections to this explanation are:—(1.) that ἐνός and εἷς are taken in two different senses. A mediator implies more than one, but God is one of the two, εἷς being used in the first clause for one and in the second for one of two; and (2.) that the point of the words ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτου is thus lost, while ver. 20. becomes a useless appendage to them.

Let us add an illustration in which the same form of thought is applied to another subject which is more familiar to us.

Suppose a person taking the text “There is one mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus,” to argue “Now, if priests truly mediate, there could not be one mediator,” and to express this in the same form as St. Paul, he would say, “Now, priests imply more than one, but Christ is one.” Christ is one, therefore there can be no priesthood but His in the Christian religion; so here, God is one, therefore in the highest revelation of Him, there can be no mediator as in the Jewish religion.

Ver. 21. Are we to infer from this that the law is opposed to the promises of God? Not so. It is only dead, imperfect, abstract; if it had had power and life, as it had truth and right, verily, righteousness should have been by the law. Comp. Rom. vii. 7.: “What shall we say then? Is the law sin? God forbid. Nay, I had not known sin, but by the law: for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet.”

The powerlessness of the law was the actual fact. The Apostle who carried back justification by faith to Abraham, went on to compare also the notion of the law which he gathered from his own age, with its first idea and origin. Nothing could be more different than the Christian and the Jew, the life-giving Spi-

God? God forbid; for if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should
 22 have been by the law. But the scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus
 23 Christ might be given to them that believe. But before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto

rit and the ceremonies of the law. To St. Paul it seemed impossible that the law should ever give life: not that it was bad in itself, but it seemed to have no power over mankind, and to have nothing corresponding to it in the heart of man.

22. ἀλλὰ συνέκλεισεν ἡ γραφή.] In the teaching of St. Paul, the doctrine of the law is what the doctrine of original sin is with us. Although in the sins of mankind the Apostle does somewhat faintly and distantly recognise the similitude of Adam's transgression, the law is with him the formal cause of sin, as he says in the Epistle to the Romans, iv. 15., "Where there is no law, there is no transgression." The law it is which, existing side by side with human nature in the world, convicts men of sin, whether consciously or unconsciously to themselves. Sometimes this conviction comes home to them individually; at other times, it appears like the sentence which the word of God passes upon them collectively. In this passage the words "shut up all under sin" [συνέκλεισε τὰ πάντα] refer to men generally, as what follows refers rather to the Gospel as a new revelation to the world at large, than to the reception of the Spirit in the heart of an individual. Compare Note on the Imputation of the Sin of Adam.

ἀλλά.] "But the law had another purpose."

συνέκλεισε] included men together, comp. Rom. xi. 32.

ἡ γραφή] here used for ὁ νόμος, as in many passages ὁ νόμος for the whole Scriptures.

τὰ πάντα]=humana omnia, men and their actions alike. Comp. πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις, Rom. viii. Here, as there, it is useless with words of very general meaning, to define exactly what the Apostle intended.

ἵνα...δοθῇ.] The law in St. Paul's view is the condition of the promise. As in the individual so in the world at large, the sense of sin must precede forgiveness.

ἡ ἐπαγγελία ἐκ πίστεως τοῖς πιστεύουσιν.] The repetition is not a mere tautology, but gives emphasis; "That the promise of faith may be given to them that have faith." Comp. Rom. i. 16, 17.

23. But before the faith I have spoken of came, that is, before the times of Christ and the Gospel, we were kept shut up against the revelation of faith that was to be.

The condition of the Jew and Gentile in reference to the Gospel, may be figured by the image of men within and without a prison; the first with the shining of a candle to give them light, the second wandering in darkness over the whole earth. The sun

ρούμεθα συγκλειόμενοι¹ εἰς τὴν μέλλουσαν πίστιν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι. ὥστε ὁ νόμος παιδαγωγὸς ἡμῶν γέγονεν εἰς χριστόν, ἵνα ἐκ πίστεως δικαιωθῶμεν. ἐλθούσης δὲ 24 τῆς πίστεως οὐκέτι ὑπὸ παιδαγωγόν ἔσμεν. πάντες γὰρ 26 υἱοὶ θεοῦ ἐστέ διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. ὅσοι γὰρ εἰς χριστόν ἐβαπτίσθητε, χριστόν ἐνεδύσασθε. οὐκ 27 ἐν Ἰουδαίῳ οὐδὲ Ἑλλήνι, οὐκ ἐν δούλῳ οὐδὲ ἐλεύθερῳ, 28 οὐκ ἐν ἄρσεν καὶ θήλῃ. πάντες γὰρ ὑμεῖς εἰς ἐστέ ἐν

¹ συγκλειόμενοι.

arises upon both; to the latter disclosing an endless prospect, while the former, with their candle grown dim before the coming day, are still within the curtains of their tabernacle. No longer φρουρούμενοι ὑπὸ νόμον, they are afraid to come out and look upon the light of heaven. The world is all before them if they did but know it, and every part full of the Divine presence.

ὥστε ὁ νόμος παιδαγωγὸς ἡμῶν γέγονεν εἰς χριστόν.] The Apostle changes the figure, and presents the law under a milder aspect. While we were unable to take care of ourselves, the law was our tutor "to bring us to Christ." The law was nothing in itself, but was, as it were, the instrument of our education, whereby learning the difference of right and wrong, we became conscious of evil in our own souls. That was the relation in which the law stood to us, that we might know the strength of sin, and trust solely to the grace of Christ.

26. πάντες γὰρ υἱοὶ θεοῦ ἐστέ.] The connexion of these words is with παιδαγωγός. St. Paul is again "going off upon a word." The law educates us as sons, "for ye are all the sons of God;" or

better, we are no longer the "wards of the law," for God is pleased to reckon us as his sons. In the word πάντες there is a latent allusion to the Gentile Christians: "For ye are the sons of God, Gentiles as well as Jews alike."

διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.] These words admit of two constructions. Either we may read, Ye are all sons through faith in Christ Jesus; or, Ye are all one in Christ Jesus, that is, as believers through faith.

27. The latter interpretation agrees best with the following verse:—"Ye are all sons of God in Christ Jesus; for ye have put on Christ as many of you as were baptized into Him." The figure of putting on Christ has a reference, first, to the robe in which the newly baptized person was arrayed on coming up out of the water, and recalls also an idiomatic expression in later Greek, of "putting on another" to signify close and intimate friendship with him. See on Rom. xiii. 14. In this latter passage, St. Paul exhorts the Romans to put on Christ, although they were already baptized, as here he implies that they had

24 the faith which should afterwards be revealed. So*
 that the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto
 25 Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But after
 that faith is come, we are no longer under a school-
 26 master. For ye are all the children of God by faith in
 27 Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been bap-
 28 tized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither
 Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is
 neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ

attained the state thus described. In one sense the believer is regenerate; in another, not. His whole life is anticipated in the beginning, and still he may be exhorted to believe. Compare Col. iii. 9, 10.: — “Putting off the old man with his actions; and putting on the new man which is renewed unto knowledge in the image of him that created him,”

The 27th verse gives the reason of the 26th, “Ye are the sons of God, as ye are one in Christ Jesus; for in your baptism ye became one with Him;” as the 28th expands the idea of the 27th. As in Rom. iii. 28. from the revelation of righteousness by faith the Apostle passes to the universality of salvation, so here from all men being one in Christ, to the enumeration of those who are included in this union. The same thought recurs in nearly the same connexion, in Col. iii. 11.

28. It has been often asked whether Christianity has altered the condition of women and slaves; and the answer sometimes given is, that no positive precepts are found in the New

Testament forbidding that subjection of either, which seemed natural to the ancient world. Some have even thought that the spirit of the Gospel tended rather to slavery than to freedom, in enjoining the forgiveness of injury and discouraging the desire to be free. It is true that no class or sex is encouraged by Christianity to claim its rights; yet not the less surely in the lapse of centuries did the Gospel mould the institutions of mankind. It was a leaven which was hid in three measures of meal, until the whole was leavened. Of the world and the Roman empire, and the institutions of ancient times, no less than of the Jewish religion, the words of Christ hold good:—“Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up again.” And with reference to the present verse, it could not but be a consequence of regarding men and women, bond and free, as one and alike in the presence of God, that their spiritual freedom became also an external and actual one.

εἰς ἓστὲ ἐν χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.] Ye are one person in being one with Christ.

χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. εἰ δὲ ὑμεῖς χριστοῦ, ἄρα τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ ²⁹
σπέρμα ἐστέ, ¹ κατ' ἐπαγγελίαν κληρονόμοι.

¹ Add καί.

29. εἰ δὲ ὑμεῖς χριστοῦ.] But if ye are Christ's, and members of his body, then as Christ was the seed of Abraham, so likewise are ye the heirs of that promise

which was made to Abraham in reference to Christ.

The whole argument from ver. 26. turns upon the oneness of the believer with Christ. This it is

- 29 Jesus. And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, ¹ heirs according to the promise.

¹ *Add and.*

which makes him the son of God. This it is which is given, not to the Jew only, but to all mankind. This it is which is the means whereby he is made the

heir of the promises to Abraham, the coheir with Christ, who is in a special sense, the seed of promise.

Λέγω δέ, ἐφ' ὅσον χρόνον ὁ κληρονόμος νηπίος ἐστίν, 4
οὐδὲν διαφέρει δούλου, κύριος πάντων ὢν, ἀλλὰ ὑπὸ 2
ἐπιτρόπους ἐστὶν καὶ οἰκονόμους ἄχρι τῆς προθεσμίας
τοῦ πατρός. οὕτως καὶ ἡμεῖς ὅτε ἤμεν νήπιοι, ὑπὸ τὰ 3

IV. The 24th verse of the preceding chapter suggested a train of imagery, which is continued in that on which we are entering. "We are no longer under a schoolmaster, but the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus, the seed of Abraham, and heirs according to the promise." The mention of the word "heirs" gives a new turn to the figure. The heir, while he is a child, is a servant in his own house; but now "the Son has made us free," and we are "lords of all."

The verses which follow (8, 9.) can only be explained on the supposition that the Galatians were both Jews and Gentiles; Jews in feeling, Gentiles in origin. It would be hard to suppose that the Apostle is transferring to them his own previous state; or, in other words, that he speaks of them as returning to Judaism, because their defection to Jewish practices would have been a "return" to himself. We are, therefore, led to assume, that the Galatians had been Jewish proselytes, who naturally, though Gentiles, returned to the weak and beggarly elements in which they had been for a time brought up. (See Introduction.) The passage 12—20. is more abrupt and fragmentary than almost any other in the Epistles of St. Paul, and for that reason one of the most obscure. It reminds us of the impassioned bursts in the Epistle to the Corinthians, where,

as here, feeling seems to take the place of logical order or arrangement; and reproof, affection, admonition, thoughts of himself and them, anger at the false teachers, painful recollections of the past, mingle hurriedly in the Apostle's mind. At the 21st verse, the style of the discourse changes. Again turning to the history of the patriarchs, he adapts another passage to the instruction of those who desired to be under the law — the narrative of the two sons of Abraham, or the allegory of the two covenants.

1. Λέγω δέ, *Now I say.*] But I carry the figure a step further. As we are heirs, so also there was a time before we came to the inheritance. That was our state under the law. It was a period of tutelage and guardianship, which we now look back upon; when we were as servants in our own house, having nothing, and yet possessing all things.

Compare for an image nearly similar John, viii. 35.: — "The servant abideth not in the house for ever: but the Son abideth ever. If the Son, therefore, shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed."

2. ἄχρι τῆς προθεσμίας, *until the time appointed,*] answers to ὅτε δὲ ἦλθεν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου; a further coincidence in the figure. There is an appointed time when the duties of the guardian cease; so there is an appointed time at which the

- 4 Now I say, That the heir, as long as he is a child,
differeth nothing from a servant, though he be lord of
2 all; but is under tutors and governors until the time
3 appointed of the father. Even so we, when we were

power of the law ceases, and the Son comes into the world.

3. Even so we, when we were children, were enslaved under the elements of the world. The latter words (*στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου*) have received various interpretations:—(1.) Nature-worship; either the observance of Jewish feasts, or the adoration of the hosts of heaven. It may be doubted, whether St. Paul would have described the first of these as a worship of elements; or, whether the second is justified by the connexion of the passage. (2.) The religion of this visible world. But there is no trace of St. Paul opposing, in this abstract manner, the religion of the seen to the religion of the unseen. (3.) The rudiments of the religion of the world; the beginning of knowledge to those who “were not yet, in understanding, men,” as implied in the previous verses. There still seems an inappropriateness in the word (*κόσμος*) world, which does not teach the rudiments of religion, but is itself the opposing principle to religion (compare Gal. vi. 14.), being spoken of in this way. The connexion of *στοιχεῖα* with *τοῦ κόσμου*, in the sense of rudiments, is further inconsistent with the supposed allusion to the *παιδαγωγός*, which precedes.

The words *στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου* occur also in Col. ii. 8. — *βλέπετε μή τις ἔσται ὑμᾶς ὁ συλαγωγῶν διὰ τῆς φιλοσοφίας καὶ κενῆς ἀπάτης κατὰ τὴν παρά-*

δοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, κατὰ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου καὶ οὐ κατὰ χριστόν, and is repeated in ver. 20. — *εἰ ἀπεθάνετε σὺν χριστῷ ἀπὸ τῶν στοιχείων τοῦ κόσμου, τί ὡς ζῶντες ἐν κόσμῳ δογματίζεσθε*; where the context would lead us to think, not of elementary knowledge, but of excess of knowledge, vain deceit, will worship, &c. There, as here (comp. ver. 8. 16—18.), the state of error incidentally alluded to, is a confusion of Judaism and heathenism; in the 8th verse itself, the words *φιλοσοφία* and *κόσμος* seeming to refer to the heathen, *κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων* to the Jewish element. To give *στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου* the same meaning in both passages, we had better translate it, “principles of the world,” which will agree with the 9th verse of Gal. iv., “weak and beggarly elements” or “principles,” which, as it is an expression inapplicable to nature-worship, in some degree fixes the meaning of *στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου* in the present passage by excluding that explanation of the words.

The expression, “principles of the world,” is so ideal, that it is impossible to say precisely what the Apostle meant by it, any more than what he meant by “rulers of the darkness of this world.” As to ourselves, so to St. Paul the world means that portion of evil or of mankind, with which we come most nearly into contact, and which is most directly opposed to

στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου ἡμεν δεδουλωμένοι· ὅτε δὲ ἦλθεν 4
 τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου, ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν
 αὐτοῦ, γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικός, γενόμενον ὑπὸ νόμον, ἵνα 5
 τοὺς ὑπὸ νόμον ἐξαγοράσῃ, ἵνα τὴν υἰοθεσίαν ἀπολάβωμεν.
 ὅτι δέ ἐστε υἱοί, ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸ πνεῦμα 6
 τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν, κρᾶζον Ἀββᾶ ὁ
 πατὴρ. ὥστε οὐκέτι εἰ δοῦλος, ἀλλὰ υἱός· εἰ δὲ υἱός, 7
 καὶ κληρονόμος διὰ θεοῦ.¹

¹ Θεοῦ διὰ χριστοῦ.

us, as well as all the world which is unknown to us, and which we define within the limits of an abstract term. To him it especially denoted the heathen world, the evil of which was again a figure of the Jewish, just as the Jewish law was a figure of the law written in the heart of the Gentile. "The principles of this world" is an expression analogous to "the fashion of this world," "the wisdom of this world." The world in this generalised meaning of it, is applied both to Jew and Gentile; not, I think, under any idea that "Jew and Gentile" were the two parts of one prior dispensation, or as it has been expressed by Goethe, that "the Jewish is the first of the ethnic religions, but still ethnic," but because both belonged to one common form of evil.

4. *ὅτε δὲ ἦλθεν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου, but when the fulness of time was come.*] Shall we say that great events arise from antecedents, or without them; in the fulness of time, or out of due time? by sudden crises, or with long purpose and preparation? It is impossible for us to view the great changes of the world under any of these aspects ex-

clusively. The spread of the Roman empire, the fall of the Jewish nation, the decline of the heathen religions, the long series of prophecy and teaching, are the natural links which connect the Gospel with the actual state of mankind, the causes, humanly speaking, of its spread, and the soil in which it grew. But there was something else mysterious and inexplicable beyond and above all these causes, of which no account can be given, which came into existence at a particular time, because God chose that it should come into existence at that time. This Providential time is what the Apostle calls "the fulness of time," not because in the modern way of reflection the causes and antecedents of the Gospel were already in being, but because it was the time appointed of God, the mysterious hour when the great revelation was to be made. It is when contemplated from within, not from without, that it appears to him to be the fulness of time; standing in the same relation to the world at large, that the moment of conversion does to the individual soul.

γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικός, born of a

children, were in bondage under the elements of the
 4 world: but when the fulness of the time was come, God
 sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the
 5 law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we
 6 might receive the adoption of sons. And because ye are
 sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your
 7 hearts, crying, Abba, Father. Wherefore thou art no
 more a servant, but a son; and if a son, then an heir
 through God.¹

¹ Of God through Christ.

woman,] i. e. with a human nature, according to a common Hebrew expression (comp. Job, xiv. 1.), not attributed to Christ with the purpose of distinguishing Him either from Adam or from mankind in general.

γενόμενον ὑπὸ νόμον.] Christ took upon Him, not merely human nature, but the seed of Abraham. That was the second condition of His redeeming mankind, that He should be like them, that they might be like Him. See iii. 13.

5. τοῦς ὑπὸ νόμον, those under the law.] Is this said of Jews or of Gentiles? Of "the Jew first, and afterwards of the Gentile." The Apostle, in retracing the scheme of Providence, is speaking chiefly of Jews, in allusion to the Judaizing errors of the Galatians, indirectly also of Gentiles. The words ἐκ γυναικὸς γενόμενον in the previous verse, refer to all mankind. Compare Rom. iii. 19. 20. for a similar ambiguity; also, Gal. iv. 24.

νοθεσίαν ἀπολάβωμεν, that we may receive back our intended sonship.] Here, as in verse 26. of the preceding chapter, the Apostle mingles two different metaphors. We are servants,

then sons; but as children we were always sons, and only receive back what was originally designed for us.

ἀπολάβωμεν.] Here the allusion to Gentiles becomes clearer, and in the next verse the Apostle addresses the Galatians directly.

6. ὅτι δέ ἐστε υἱοί.] It is the effect, and also the proof of your sonship, that God sent the Spirit of His Son into our hearts, crying, Father." Comp. Rom. viii. 17. The result of which is the conviction that we are the sons of God.

7. διὰ Θεοῦ.] The reading of the majority of MSS. in this passage has scarcely anything in its favour, except its difficulty. The common language of Scripture describes God as the end rather than the means of salvation. But compare i. 1. The context seems to require—"Thou art not a servant, but a son; and if a son, an heir through Christ, as being one with the heir." Instead of this, adopting the words διὰ Θεοῦ we must refer them back to Θεός in the preceding verse:—"The same God who gave you his spirit, as he has made you sons, so has he made you heirs."

Ἀλλὰ τότε μὲν οὐκ εἰδότες θεὸν ἐδουλεύσατε τοῖς 8
 φύσει μὴ¹ οὖσι θεοῖς· νῦν δὲ γνόντες θεόν, μᾶλλον δὲ 9
 γνωσθέντες ὑπὸ θεοῦ, πῶς ἐπιστρέφετε πάλιν ἐπὶ τὰ
 ἄσθενῇ καὶ πτωχὰ στοιχεῖα, οἷς πάλιν ἄνωθεν δουλεῦν
 θέλετε; ἡμέρας παρατηρεῖσθε καὶ μῆνας καὶ καιροὺς καὶ 10
 ἡμερομηνίας; φοβοῦμαι ὑμᾶς, μή πως εἰκὴ κεκοπίακα εἰς 11
 ὑμᾶς. γίνεσθε ὡς ἐγώ, ὅτι καὶ ἐγώ ὡς ὑμεῖς, ἀδελφοί, 12
 δέομαι ὑμῶν. οὐδὲν με ἡδίκησατε· οἴδατε δὲ ὅτι δι' 13

¹ μὴ φύσει.

8. Ἀλλὰ] marks emphatically the contrast between their former and present state. τοῖς φύσει μὴ οὖσι θεοῖς is equivalent to the expression in 1 Cor. viii. 5., οἱ λεγόμενοι θεοί, gods who have no real existence in nature, but only in the thoughts and language of men. Heathen idolatry had a twofold aspect to the mind of a believer in St. Paul's day. First, it produced the impression of unmeaningness and deadness in itself, and senselessness in its worshippers. The gods that the heathen worshipped, were no gods; there was no spirit or life in them, none to hear or answer. When a man looked around upon the state of the heathen world, the reflection suggested itself "that an idol is nothing in the world." Next, as the religions of East and West met and mingled, the powers of evil seemed to stir again. It was not a dead opposition, but a living force, which Jewish fanaticism for the law opposed to the Gospel. And when the heathen worship allied itself with impurity, it was a doctrine of devils; and the feast in the idol's temple, a table of devils.

9. νῦν δὲ γνόντες θεόν.] This clause, like the previous one,

shows that there must have been a time when the Galatians were Gentiles. They had passed from idols to serve the living God.

μᾶλλον δὲ γνωσθέντες ὑπὸ θεοῦ.] All that we are in relation to God, more truly speaking we receive from Him. Comp. 1 Cor. viii. 3., εἰ δέ τις ἀγαπᾷ τὸν θεόν, οὗτος ἔγνωσται ὑπ' αὐτοῦ. Also 1 Cor. xiii. 12., τότε δὲ ἐπιγνώσομαι καθὼς καὶ ἐπεγνώσθην. The knowledge of God is also the reflex act of the Divinity upon Himself, who thereby seals man as his own.

πῶς ἐπιστρέφετε πάλιν.] The going back is, in the mind of St. Paul, the inversion of the order of Providence, who willed that the law should precede, not follow, the Gospel. It was also a return to the state in which the Galatians were before they received the Gospel. For the weakness of the law compare the expression, Rom. viii. 3.:—"What the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh." The law was weak and meagre, and could never have power to save men.

Ἐλέγετε.] To which again ye are of your own accord in bondage.

10. Ye observe sabbath days, and new moons, and times for

8 Howbeit then, when ye knew not God, ye did ser-
 9 vice unto them which by nature are no gods. But
 now, after that ye have known God, or rather are known
 of God, how turn ye again to the weak and beggarly
 elements, whereunto ye desire * to begin again to be in
 10 bondage? Ye observe days, and months, and times, and
 11 years. I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you
 12 labour in vain. Brethren, I beseech you, be as I am; for I
 13 am as ye are. Ye have not injured me at all. Ye know how

feasts, and sabbatical years. That is to say, ye observe all the requirements of the Jewish law. Compare Col. ii. 16.:—"Let no man judge you in meat or in drink, or in respect of an holyday, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days."

12. "Do ye become as I am, for I am as ye are." Compare for the play of words, Rom. xvi. 13. "Salute Rufus, and his mother and mine;" ver. 23. "Gaius, mine host, and of the whole Church;" also 2 Cor. xii. 20. "I fear, lest, coming unto you, I shall find you such as I will not, and be found of you such as ye would not;" where there is a similar ambiguity. Here the Apostle would say, "Seek not to differ from me, for I am one in heart with you." A slightly different turn may also be given:—"Be ye Gentiles, followers of me, even as I, being a Jew, make myself a Gentile like you." Comp. 1 Cor. ix. 21. *τοῖς ἀνόμοις ὡς ἄνομος*.

The Apostle changes his tone. His old affection for the Galatians revives, and he implores them to consider that he is not speaking of any personal wrongs of his own. He is touched by the memory of their attachment to him

while he was yet with them. "I know how weak and feeble I was, how much reason there was for you to despise me; but you did not, rather you received me as an angel of God. Your affection for me was indeed extravagant; there was nothing which you would not have done for me."

οὐδέν με ἠδικήσατε.] Any connexion with the preceding, such as "Be ye as I am; for I made myself, and ye allowed me to be like you in all things; ye wronged me in nothing;" is forced. It is better to consider the Apostle as recalling, without exact connexion, his reminiscences of the Galatian Church. "I make no complaint of you."

οἶδατε δὲ ὅτι δι' ἀσθενείαν τῆς σαρκός.] In the explanation of *διὰ* we have to choose between ordinary Greek usage and the sense of the passage. "Ye know that it was on occasion of an illness that I preached to you at first." There would be no want of courtesy to the Galatians in this, if we only lay the stress on the latter part of the sentence. "You saw that it was a mere accident that made me preach to you, yet you showed no want of care or tenderness to me." Yet it seems

ἀσθένειαν τῆς σαρκὸς εὐηγγελισάμην ὑμῖν τὸ πρότερον,
καὶ τὸν πειρασμὸν ὑμῶν¹ ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου· οὐκ ἔξου- 14
θενήσατε οὐδὲ ἐξεπτύσατε, ἀλλὰ ὡς ἄγγελον θεοῦ ἐδέ-
ξασθέ με, ὡς χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν. ποῦ οὖν² ὁ μακαρισμὸς 15
ὑμῶν; μαρτυρῶ γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι, εἰ δυνατόν, τοὺς ὀφθαλ-
μοὺς ὑμῶν ἐξορύξαντες³ ἐδώκατέ μοι. ὥστε ἐχθρὸς 16
ὑμῶν γέγονα ἀληθεύων ὑμῖν; ζηλοῦσιν ὑμᾶς οὐ καλῶς, 17
ἀλλὰ ἐκκλείσαι ὑμᾶς θέλουσιν, ἵνα αὐτοὺς ζηλοῦτε.
καλὸν δὲ ζηλοῦσθαι ἐν καλῷ πάντοτε, καὶ μὴ μόνον ἐν 18

¹ μου τότε.² τίς οὖν ἦν.³ Add ἔν.

hardly likely that the Apostle would have spoken of mere illness, in the succeeding verse, as a temptation in the flesh. It is more probable that he is here alluding to the σκόλοψ ἐν τῇ σαρκί, or at any rate, to that depression of spirit and feebleness of bodily presence which he refers to elsewhere in 2 Corinthians, and which is the most probable explanation of the thorn in the flesh. Of mere sickness he would hardly have used such strong language as ἐξεπτύσατε, which seems to imply something perhaps painful, perhaps ridiculous, such as would naturally move the disgust of mankind. Compare 2 Cor. x. 10. :—*ἡ δὲ παρουσία τοῦ σώματος ἀσθενὴς καὶ ὁ λόγος ἐξουθενημένος*. He is describing the state in which he preached to them, not some accidental cause of his mission. For the use of *διὰ* in this sense compare Phil. i. 15. *δι' εὐδοκίαν κηρύσσουσιν*. Even were there no such parallel, the context is often a safer guide to the meaning of prepositions than their uncertain usage in a writer like St. Paul.

You looked upon my face as

upon the face of an angel. You thought you saw Christ Himself in the person of His servant.

15. *ποῦ οὖν ὁ μακαρισμὸς ὑμῶν; where then is your joy?* What has become of your joy? that is, you have no joy. I speak of it, because you seemed to have a joy, though you really had it not; for I bear you witness that there is nothing which you would not have done for me.

μακαρισμός] is used in the Romans for the external state of blessedness, chap. iv.; here, for the inward feeling of it, compare Gal. iii. 2.

ὥστε] = so that it follows, from your former excess of affection for me.

17. *ζηλοῦσιν ὑμᾶς οὐ καλῶς.* They show a zeal for you not in a good way, but they would even (1.) shut you out from the Gospel, (2.) or from us, that ye may zealously affect them. Comp. *συγκλειόμενοι*, iii. 23.

18. *καλὸν δὲ τὸ ζηλοῦσθαι.* But it is good to be zealously entreated, always in a good thing. It is difficult to find an explanation of these words, suitable both to what has preceded, and what follows in the succeeding clause.

amid * infirmity of the flesh I preached the gospel unto
 14 you at the first, and your ¹ temptation which was in my
 flesh. Ye despised not, nor rejected it; but received me
 15 as an angel of God, even as Christ Jesus. Where is
 then the blessedness ye spake of? for I bear you record,
 that, if it had been possible, ye would have plucked out
 16 your own eyes, and have given them to me. Am I
 therefore become your enemy, because I tell you the
 17 truth? They zealously entreat* you, but not well; yea,
 they would exclude you, that ye might affect them.
 18 But it is good to be zealously entreated* always in a

¹ My.

In ver. 15. the Apostle had said in a figure that nothing could exceed the zealous attachment of the Galatians to him while he was with them; they would have plucked out their eyes for him. So that he had just made them his enemies by speaking the truth. Very different was the conduct of the Judaizing teachers; they sought only how they might produce this zealous attachment, not certainly by speaking the truth; they would if possible monopolise the affection of their converts. Thus far we have had two trains of thought suggested by each other:—(1.) the zealous affection of the Galatians to the Apostle; (2.) the zealous affection of the false teachers for the Galatians themselves. The Apostle proceeds:—“But it is good to be the object of this zealous affection, such as you showed to me, such as they show to you, in a good thing, at all times;” and then returning to the first thread of association, he adds, “and not only when I am

present with you.” As though he said, “It is a good thing that you and they should be the objects of these warm feelings to each other, and yet it is a pity that you forget absent friends. How earnestly were you attached me! How soon did you forget me!”

Another way of tracing the connexion is as follows:—The first clause of verse 13. may be opposed to verse 17.: “There was warm affection between you and them. But warm affection is always good where it relates to a good object;”—a general statement which describes the opposite case to that of the Galatians and the false teachers, under which, however, lurks the thought of that true affection which they had felt to the Apostle himself, and suggests the clause which follows, “and not only while I am present with you.” It is good to be the object of these strong feelings where the matter in hand is good (*sub.* which was not your

τῷ παρεῖναι με πρὸς ὑμᾶς, τέκνα¹ μου, οὓς πάλιν ὠδίνω 19
 ἄχρις οὐ μορφωθῇ χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν. ἤθελον δὲ παρεῖναι 20
 πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἄρτι καὶ ἀλλάξαι τὴν φωνήν μου, ὅτι ἀπο-
 ροῦμαι ἐν ὑμῖν.

Λέγετέ μοι, οἱ ὑπὸ νόμον θέλοντες εἶναι, τὸν νόμον 21
 οὐκ ἀκούετε; γέγραπται γὰρ ὅτι Ἀβραὰμ δύο υἱοὺς 22

¹ τέκνια.

case with the false teachers); good, too, that such feelings should not be so transitory as you have shown to me.

None of the difficulties of this passage are removed, though new ones are superadded by taking ζηλοῦσθαι actively, a sense in which it is not elsewhere found, and which is also inconsistent with the previous ζηλοῦτε.

19. οὓς πάλιν ὠδίνω, *of whom I travail again.*] The Galatians who had fallen away have again to go through a new birth in the Gospel, before they can be again conformed to the image of Christ. As in other passages, St. Paul compares himself to a spiritual father who had begotten many sons in the Gospel, so here he likens himself to a mother travailing in sorrow because "there was not strength to bring forth."

20. ἤθελον [or ἤθελον ἄν.] "I could wish;" like ηὐχόμεν for ηὐχόμεν ἄν, in Rom. ix. 3. δὲ appears to arise out of the idea of absence hinted at in ἐν τῷ παρεῖναι of ver. 18.: "I am absent, but I wish I were present."

ἀλλάξαι τὴν φωνήν μου.] Either to speak in a different tone from that in which I am now writing, or to use a different tone from what I did when with you.

ὅτι ἀποροῦμαι ἐν ὑμῖν, *I stand in doubt of you.*] "Because I am in a strait in reference to you, I know not how to deal with you." (Comp. Heb. vi. 6.:—"It is impossible to renew them again to repentance if they shall fall away.") Comp. 2 Cor. x. 10. 11.:—"For his letters, say they, are weighty and powerful; but his bodily presence is weak, and his speech contemptible. Let such an one think this, that, such as we are in word when we are absent, such will we be also in deed when we are present."

21. I will try another method with you, perchance the words of the law may have more weight with you than my own. "Ye then that desire to be under the law, hear an allegory which is taken from the law."

Whether this is an argument or an illustration, is a question that naturally occurs to the mind of the reader. To an Alexandrian writer of the first century (may we say, therefore, to St. Paul himself?) the question itself could hardly have been made intelligible. That very modern distinction between argument and illustration was precisely what his mind wanted, to place it on a level with the modes of thought of our own age. We must, therefore, find some other way of

- good thing, and not only when I am present with you.
 19 My¹ children, of whom I travail in birth again until
 20 Christ be formed in you, I desire to be present with you
 now, and to change my voice; for I stand in doubt of
 you.
 21 Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not
 22 hear the law? For it is written, that Abraham had

¹ Add little.

characterising the passage. It is neither an argument nor an illustration, but an interpretation of the Old Testament Scripture, after the manner of the age in which St. Paul lived; that is, after the manner of the Jewish and Christian Alexandrian writers. Whatever difference there is between him and them, or between Philo and the Christian fathers as interpreters of Scripture, is not one of kind, but of degree. The Christian writers lay aside many of the extravagancies of Philo; St. Paul is free also from their extravagancies, employing only casually, and exceptionally, and when reasoning "with those who desire to be under the law," what they use habitually and unsparingly, so as to overlay, and in some cases to destroy the original sense. Instead of seeking to draw subtle distinctions between the method of St. Paul and that of his age, probably of the school in which he was brought up, it is better to observe that the noble spirit of the Apostle shines through the "elements of the law" in which he clothes his meaning. Strange as it may at first appear that his mode of interpreting the Old Testament Scriptures should not conform to our laws of logic or lan-

guage, it would be far stranger if it had not conformed with the natural modes of thought and association in his own day. See Essay on Quotations from Old Testament.

22, 23. There is a peculiar allusion conveyed by the expression *κατὰ σάρκα*, which the Apostle has usually applied to the Jews as opposed to the Christian Church. In the very terms of his statement, he has linked the interpretation of the allegory with the narrative itself.

In what follows, the law and the Gospel are paralleled with the two children of Abraham. The one was his natural child according to the flesh, with which notion of fleshly descent the Jewish dispensation is inseparably bound up; the other was the spiritual child, born according to promise, with which promise, in the previous chapter, the Gospel has already been identified. Which things are spoken in one way, but designed to be understood in another. For Ishmael and Isaac are two covenants; the one from mount Sinai, answering to the Jerusalem that now is; the other bearing the image of the heavenly Jerusalem. The points of comparison may be exhibited as follows:—

ἔσχεν, ἓνα ἐκ τῆς παιδίσκης καὶ ἓνα ἐκ τῆς ἐλευθέρας.
 ἀλλ' ὁ [μὲν] ἐκ τῆς παιδίσκης κατὰ σάρκα γεγέννηται, ²³
 ὁ δὲ ἐκ τῆς ἐλευθέρας διὰ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας. ἅτινά ἐστιν ²⁴
 ἀλληγορούμενα. αὐταὶ γάρ εἰσιν ¹ δύο διαθήκαι, μία μὲν
 ἀπὸ ὄρους Σινᾶ, εἰς δουλείαν γεννώσα, ἥτις ἐστὶν Ἄγαρ
 (τὸ γὰρ ² Σινᾶ ὄρος ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ Ἀραβίᾳ), συστοιχεί δὲ ²⁵
 τῇ νῦν Ἱερουσαλὴμ (δουλεῖν γὰρ ³ μετὰ τῶν τέκνων
 αὐτῆς). ἡ δὲ ἄνω Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἐλευθέρα ἐστίν, ἥτις ²⁶
 ἐστὶν μήτηρ [πάντων] ἡμῶν. γέγραπται γάρ Εὐφράν- ²⁷
 θητι στεῖρα ἢ οὐ τίκτουσα, ῥῆξον καὶ βόησον ἢ οὐκ

¹ Add αἱ.² Add Ἄγαρ.³ δέ.

HAGAR.

The child according to the flesh.
 Mount Sinai in the land of the
 children of Hagar. "The
 law."

The bondwoman.

Jerusalem in bondage with her
 children.

SARAH.

The child according to promise.
 The Gospel.

The free woman who had been
 barren.

The Jerusalem which is above,
 and is free, and the mother of
 all mankind.

The bondwoman to be cast forth
 by the free woman.

ἀλληγορούμενα· ἐτέρως μὲν λε-
 γόμενα, ἐτέρως δὲ νοούμενα, Scho-
 lia. "Which have a different
 meaning, for their true meaning
 is that they are two covenants."

μία μὲν... εἰς δουλείαν γεννώσα.]
 The image is here a little forced.
 It was not in the fact, but in the
 feeling of the Israelite towards
 him, that the elder served the
 younger. The Apostle, identi-
 fying Hagar with the law and
 the law with slavery, makes the
 bondwoman also the mother of
 bondmen.

25. τὸ γὰρ Σινᾶ ὄρος ἐστὶν ἐν
 τῇ Ἀραβίᾳ.] The MS. authority
 and later editors are nearly
 divided about the admission of

the word Ἄγαρ in this verse.
 The insertion, however, does
 little towards supplying the con-
 nexion of the 25th and 24th
 verses; as the old explanations,
 that Hagar is the Arabic word
 for a rock, or the Arabic name of
 mount Sinai (whether we sup-
 pose it probable, or otherwise,
 that St. Paul would have quoted
 Arabic words in writing to the
 Galatians), are destitute of founda-
 tion. A sufficient sense is ob-
 tained by laying the stress on ἐν
 τῇ Ἀραβίᾳ. "For mount Sinai
 is in Arabia, the land of the
 children of Hagar;" or "For this
 Hagar is mount Sinai in the
 land of the children of Hagar."

two sons, the one by a bondmaid, the other by a free-
 23 woman. But he who was of the bondwoman was born
 after the flesh; but he of the freewoman was by promise.
 24 Which things are an allegory: for these are the two
 covenants; the one from the mount Sinai, which gen-
 25 dereth to bondage, which is Agar (for this mount
 Sinai is in Arabia¹), and answereth to Jerusalem which
 26 now is (for she is² in bondage with her children). But
 Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother
 27 of us all. For it is written, Rejoice, thou barren
 that bearest not; break forth and cry, thou that

¹ For this Agar is mount Sinai in Arabia.² And is.

Comp. Ps. lxxxiii. 7. That is to say, Hagar typifies the law given on mount Sinai, because mount Sinai is in the country of the descendants of Hagar. Such appears to be the least objectionable mode of explaining the passage, against which it can only be urged that there is an apparent obscurity and over-subtlety in the allusion. The explanation is assisted by taking the words, τὸ γὰρ Σινᾶ ὄρος ἔστιν ἐν τῇ Ἀραβίᾳ as a parenthesis, and connecting the following clause συστροιχεῖ δέ with μία διαθήκη preceding.

"These are the two covenants; the one gendering into bondage which is Hagar (for mount Sinai is in the land Hagar), which answers to Jerusalem that now is." δουλεύει γάρ — for the point of the comparison is, that she and her descendants are slaves.

26. Here St. Paul drops the figure and compares the heavenly Jerusalem with the Jerusalem that now is. What we expect to follow is—"But the other covenant is Sarah the free woman

whose children are free." Instead of this, the Apostle only works out the idea of freedom as opposed to bondage.

The same image occurs in Rev. xxi. 2. — "The holy city, the New Jerusalem, descending out of heaven like a bride adorned for her husband;" and in Heb. xii. 22. — "Ye have come near to mount Sion, the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem." Like all similar images, it is taken in a more or less spiritual sense, according to the spirituality of those who make use of, or receive it. That it is a city of freedom, neither in bondage to the Romans, nor in bondage to the law of Moses, is the manner in which the Apostle pictures it.

[πάντων] ἡμῶν.] πάντων is an ancient various reading, occurring in Cod. A. and in Irenæus.

27. Isa. liv. 1. from the LXX. The Apostle applies these words to Sarah, and through her to the Christian Church, which has

ωδίνουσα, ὅτι πολλὰ τὰ τέκνα τῆς ἐρήμου μάλλον ἢ τῆς
 ἐχούσης τὸν ἄνδρα. ὑμεῖς¹ δέ, ἀδελφοί, κατὰ Ἰσαὰκ²⁸
 ἐπαγγελίας τέκνα ἐστέ. ἀλλ' ὥσπερ τότε ὁ κατὰ σάρκα²⁹
 γεννηθεὶς ἐδίωκεν τὸν κατὰ πνεῦμα, οὕτως καὶ νῦν.
 ἀλλὰ τί λέγει ἡ γραφή; *Εκβαλε τὴν παιδίσκην καὶ τὸν³⁰
 υἱὸν αὐτῆς· οὐ γὰρ μὴ κληρονομήσει² ὁ υἱὸς τῆς
 παιδίσκης ἔμετὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς ἐλευθέρας. διό³, ἀδελφοί,³¹
 οὐκ ἐσμὲν παιδίσκας τέκνα, ἀλλὰ τῆς ἐλευθέρας.

¹ ἡμεῖς . . . ἐσμὲν.² κληρονομήσει.³ ἔρα.

been called in the previous verse, "the mother of us all."

ὅτι πολλὰ τὰ τέκνα.] Because the wife who is deserted, hath many more children than she who has the husband.

Compare, for a trace of the same thought, Rom. iv. 19., Heb. vi. 11.

28. Now you, brethren, as Isaac was, are children of the promise. Above St. Paul had linked together the Gospel and the promise to the exclusion of the law. Here he repeats the same "in a figure."

29. The figure is carried on a step further. It has been already established that the believer is represented by Isaac, the adherent of the law by Ishmael. But in the Old Testament, Gen. xxi. 9., it was or seemed to be recorded that Ishmael mocked Isaac which suggests to the Apostle the thought of a further resemblance to the case of the Christian Church. All its persecution came originally from those who were the children according to the flesh; either stirring up the Gentiles against them, or as St. Paul felt in the case of the Galatian Church (v. 11. τί ἐτι διώκομαι; "Why do

I yet suffer persecution?"), persecuting by false teachers, who were really Jews, and pretended to be Christians, and sometimes "said they were Jews, and are not."

30. The image expressed St. Paul's feeling in another point. The Scripture said—"Cast forth the bondwoman and her son, for the son of the bondwoman shall not inherit with the son of the free woman." So St. Paul knew that the law and the Gospel could not exist together. It was the appointment of God that, sooner or later, the one should drive out the other.

The stories of the Rabbis have enlarged on the simple statement of the book of Genesis that Sarah saw Ishmael "playing," with her son Isaac, — the word for which neither in the Hebrew nor the LXX. admits the sense of mocking. They narrate how Isaac and Ishmael had a strife respecting the right of the first-born, and how, as they were in the field together, Ishmael pursued Isaac with his arrows, &c. Such tales the Apostle may have had in his mind when he used the words ἐδίωκεν τὸν κατὰ πνεῦμα, opposed in this passage to κατὰ σάρκα, which is

travailest not: for the desolate hath many more children
 28 than she which hath an husband. But ye¹, brethren, as
 29 Isaac was, are the children of promise. But as then he
 that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was
 born after the Spirit, even so it is now. Nevertheless
 30 what saith the scripture? Cast out the bondwoman and
 her son: for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir
 31 with the son of the freewoman. Wherefore², brethren,
 we are not children of the bondwoman, but of the free.

¹ Now we.

² So then.

our chief means of fixing its meaning. Ishmael is called the child according to the flesh, because born of the bondwoman in the natural way; Isaac is said to be the offspring according to the Spirit, because sprung supernaturally "from one as good as dead," — the heir of the promises, in whose person the dispensation of the Spirit is anticipated.

31. *διό.*] The MSS. vary between *ἄρα*, *ἄραδε*, *ἄρα οὖν*, *διό*. Lachmann and Tischendorf, *ἡμεῖς δέ*. The reading *ἄρα* reminds us of the conclusion of chap. vii. of the Romans, which, like the conclusion of the present passage, appears out of place. Throughout the whole comparison, the Apostle has assumed that we are not the children of the bondwoman, but of the free; and the further inference has been

drawn, that the bondwoman is to be cast forth. It seems too late to say, "therefore, brethren," &c. It may be urged in answer, that we cannot argue against the repetition of conclusions, or, indeed, respecting the order of thought at all, in a writer whose style is so irregular as that of St. Paul.

Whether we read *ἄρα* or *διό*, the sense would be better given by commencing a new paragraph or chapter from these words, to note that they are not so much an inference from the preceding, as a practical application of them. "Wherefore, brethren, we are not the children of the bond, but of the free." Christ made us free, stand therefore; or, according to the received reading, "Stand fast in the liberty with which Christ made us free."

FRAGMENT ON THE CHARACTER OF ST. PAUL.

*Οἴδατε δὲ ὅτι δι' ἀσθένειαν τῆς σαρκὸς εὐηγγελισάμην ὑμῖν τὸ πρότερον, καὶ τὸν πειρασμὸν ὑμῶν ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου οὐκ ἐξουθενήσατε οὐδὲ ἐξεπτύσατε, ἀλλὰ ὡς ἄγγε-
λον θεοῦ ἐδέξασθέ με, ὡς χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν.—Gal. iv. 13, 14.*

THE narrative of the Gospel gives no full or perfect likeness of the character of the Apostles. Human beings do not admit of being constructed out of a single feature; nor is imagination able to supply details which are really wanting. St. Peter and St. John, the two Apostles whose names are most prominent in the Gospels and early portion of the Acts, both seem to unite two extremes in the same person; the character of St. John combining gentleness with vehemence, almost with fierceness; while in St. Peter we seem to trace rashness and timidity at once, the spirit of freedom at one period of his life, and of narrowness and exclusiveness at another. He is the first to confess, and the first to deny Christ. Himself the captain of the Apostles, and yet wanting in the very qualities necessary to constitute a leader. Such extremes may easily meet in the same person; but we do not possess sufficient knowledge to say how they were really reconciled. Each of the Apostles grew up to the fulness of the stature of the perfect man. Even those who to us are little more than names, had individual features as lively as our own contemporaries. But the mention of their sayings or acts on four or five occasions while they followed the footsteps of the Lord on earth, and then on two or three occasions soon after He was taken from them, then once again after an interval of twelve or fourteen years, is not sufficient to enable us to judge of their whole character. We may distinguish Peter from

John, or James from either ; but we cannot set them up as a study to be compared with each other.

More features appear of the character of St. Paul, yet not sufficient to give a perfect picture. We should lose the individuality which we have, by seeking to idealise and generalise from some more common type of Christian life. It has not been unusual to describe St. Paul as a man of resolute will, of commanding energy, of high-souled eloquence, of classic taste. Not of such an one would the Apostle himself "have gloried." It was not the wisdom of this world which he spoke, but "the hidden wisdom of God in a mystery." All his life long he felt himself to be one "whose strength was perfected in weakness;" he was aware of the impression of feebleness which his own appearance and discourse made upon his converts; who was sometimes in weakness and fear and trembling before them, "having the sentence of death in himself," and at other times "in power and the Holy Ghost and in much assurance;" and so far from having one unchanging purpose or insight, that though determined to know one thing only, "Jesus Christ and Him crucified," yet in his manner of teaching he wavers between opposite views or precepts in successive verses. He is ever feeling, if haply he may find them, after the hearts of men. He is carried away by sympathy, at times even for his opponents. He is struggling to express what is in process of revelation to him. Such are some of the individual traits which he has left in his writings; they are traits far more interesting and more like himself than any general image of heroism or goodness. Whatever other impression he might have made upon us, could we have seen him face to face, there can be little doubt that he would have left the impression of what was remarkable and uncommon.

There are questions which it is interesting to suggest, even when they can never receive a perfect and satisfactory answer. One of these questions may be asked respecting St. Paul: — "What was the relation in which his former life stood to the great fact of his conversion?" He himself, in looking back upon the times in which he persecuted the Church of God, thought of them chiefly as an increasing evidence of the mercy of God, which was afterwards

extended to him. It seemed so strange to have been what he had been, and to be what he was. Nor does our own conception of him, in relation to his former self, commonly reach beyond this contrast of the old and new man; the persecutor and the preacher of the Gospel; the young man at whose feet the witnesses against Stephen laid down their clothes, and the same Paul disputing against the Grecians, full of visions and revelations of the Lord, on whom in later life came daily the care of all the Churches.

Yet we cannot but admit also the possibility, or rather the probable truth, of another point of view. If there were any among the contemporaries of St. Paul who had known him in youth and in age, they would have seen similarities such as escape us in the character of the Apostle at different periods of his life. The zealot against the Gospel might have seemed to them transfigured into the opponent of the law; they would have found something in common in the Pharisee of the Pharisees, brought up at the feet of Gamaliel, and the man who had a vow on his last journey to Jerusalem. And when they heard the narrative of his conversion from his own lips, they might have remarked that to one of his temperament only could such an event have happened, and would have noted many superficial resemblances which showed him to be the same man, while the great inward change which had overflowed upon the world was hid from their eyes.

The gifts of God to man have ever some reference to natural disposition. He who becomes the servant of God, does not thereby cease to be himself. Often the transition is greater in appearance than in reality, from its very suddenness. There is a kind of rebellion against self and nature and God, which, through the mercy of God to the soul, seems almost necessarily to lead to reaction. Persons have been worse than their fellow-men in outward appearance, and yet there was within them the spirit of a child waiting to return home to their father's house. A change passes upon them which we may figure to ourselves, not only as the new man taking the place of the old, but as the inner man taking the place of the outer. So fearfully and wonderfully are we made, that the very contrast to what we are has often an inexpressible power over us.

It seems sometimes as if the same religious education had tended to contrary results ; in one case to a devout life, in another to a reaction against it ; sometimes to one form of faith, at other times to another. Many parents have wept to see the early religious training of their children draw them by a kind of repulsion, to a communion which is the extreme opposite of that in which they have been brought up. Such facts as these have but a remote bearing on the character of St. Paul ; but they serve to make us think, that all spiritual influences, however antagonistic they may appear, have more in common with each other than they have with the temper of the world ; and that it is easier to pass from one form of faith to another, than from leading the life of all men to either. There is more in common between those who anathematise each other, than between either and the spirit of toleration which characterises the ordinary dealings of man and man, or much more the Spirit of Christ, for whom they are alike contending.

Perhaps we shall not be far wrong in concluding, that those who have undergone great religious changes, have been of a fervid imaginative cast of mind ; looking for more in this world than it was capable of yielding ; easily touched by the remembrance of the past, or inspired by some ideal of the future. When with this has been combined a zeal for the good of their fellow-men, they have become the heralds and champions of the religious movements of the world. The change has begun within, but has overflowed without them. "When thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren," is the order of nature and of grace. In secret they brood over their own state ; weary and profitless their soul fainteth within them. The religion they profess is a religion not of life to them, but of death ; they lose their interest in the world, and are cut off from the communion of their fellow-men. While they are musing, the fire kindles, and at the last—"they speak with their tongue." Then pours forth irrepressibly, the pent up stream—"unto all and upon all" their fellow-men ; the intense flame of inward enthusiasm warms and lights up the world. First, they are the evidence to others ; then, again, others are the evidence to them. All religious leaders cannot be reduced to a single type of character ; yet in all, perhaps, two characteristics may

be observed ; the first, great self-reflection ; the second, intense sympathy with other men. They are not the creatures of habit or of circumstance, leading a blind life, unconscious of what they are ; their whole effort is to realise their inward nature, and to make it palpable and visible to their fellows. Unlike other men who are confined to the circle of themselves or of their family, their affections are never straitened ; they embrace with their love all men who are like-minded with them ; almost all men too, who are unlike them, in the hope that they may become like.

Such men have generally appeared at favourable conjunctures of circumstances, when the old was about to vanish away, and the new to appear. The world has yearned towards them, and they towards the world. They have uttered what all men were feeling ; they have interpreted the age to itself. But for the concurrence of circumstances, they might have been stranded on the solitary shore, they might have died without a follower or convert. But when the world has needed them and God has intended them for the world, they are endued with power from on high ; they use all other men as their instruments, uniting them to themselves.

Often such men have been brought up in the faith which they afterwards oppose, and a part of their power has consisted in their acquaintance with the enemy. They see other men like themselves formerly, wandering out of the way in the idol's temple, amid a burdensome ceremonial, with prayers and sacrifices unable to free the soul. They lead them by the way themselves came to the home of Christ. Sometimes they represent the new as the truth of the old ; at other times as contrasted with it, as life and death, as good and evil, as Christ and anti-Christ. They relax the force of habit, they melt the pride and fanaticism of the soul. They suggest to others their own doubts, they inspire them with their own hopes, they supply their own motives, they draw men to them with cords of sympathy and bonds of love ; they themselves seem a sufficient stay to support the world. Such was Luther at the Reformation ; such, in a far higher sense, was the Apostle St. Paul.

There have been heroes in the world, and there have been prophets in the world. The first may be divided into two classes ; either they have been men of strong will and character, or of great power and

range of intellect ; in a few instances, combining both. They have been the natural leaders of mankind, compelling others by their acknowledged superiority as rulers and generals ; or in the paths of science and philosophy, drawing the world after them by a yet more inevitable necessity. The prophet belongs to another order of beings : he does not master his thoughts ; they carry him away. He does not see clearly into the laws of this world or the affairs of this world, but has a light beyond, which reveals them partially in their relation to another. Often he seems to be at once both the weakest and the strongest of men ; the first to yield to his own impulses, the mightiest to arouse them in others. Calmness, or reason, or philosophy are not the words which describe the appeals which he makes to the hearts of men. He sways them to and fro rather than governs or controls them. He is a poet, and more than a poet, the inspired teacher of mankind ; but the intellectual gifts which he possesses are independent of knowledge, or learning, or capacity ; what they are much more akin to is the fire and subtilty of genius. He too, for a time, has ruled kingdoms and even led armies ; "an Apostle, not of man, nor by men ;" acting, not by authority or commission of any prince, but by an immediate inspiration from on high communicating itself to the hearts of men.

Saul of Tarsus is called an Apostle rather than a prophet, because Hebrew prophecy belongs to an age of the world before Christianity. Now that in the Gospel that which is perfect is come, that which is in part is done away. Yet, in a secondary sense, the Apostle St. Paul is also "among the prophets." He, too, has "visions and revelations of the Lord," though he has not written them down "for our instruction," in which he would fain glory because they are not his own. Even to the outward eye he has the signs of a prophet. There is in him the same emotion, the same sympathy, the same "strength made perfect in weakness," the same absence of human knowledge, the same subtilty in the use of language, the same singleness in the delivery of his message. He speaks more as a man, and less immediately under the impulse of the Spirit of God ; more to individuals, and less to the nation at large ; he is less of a poet, and more of a teacher or preacher. But these

differences do not interfere with the general resemblance. Like Isaiah, he bids us look to "the man of sorrows;" like Ezekiel, he arouses men to a truer sense of the ways of God in His dealings with them; like Jeremiah, he mourns over his countrymen; like all the prophets who have ever been, he is lifted above this world, and is "in the Spirit at the day of the Lord." (Rev. i. 10.)

Reflections of this kind are suggested by the absence of materials such as throw any light on the early life of St. Paul. All that we know of him before his conversion is summed up in two facts, "that the witnesses laid down their clothes with a young man whose name was Saul," and that he was brought up at the feet of Gamaliel, one of the few Rabbinical teachers of Greek learning in the city of Jerusalem. We cannot venture to assign him either to the "choleric" or the "melancholic" temperament. [Tholuck.] We are unable to determine what were his natural gifts or capacities; or how far, as we often observe to be the case, the gifts which he had were called out by the mission on which he was sent, or the theatre on which he felt himself placed "a spectacle to the world, to angels, and to men." Far more interesting is it to trace the simple feelings with which he himself regarded his former life. "Last of all He was seen of me also, who am the least of the Apostles, that am not worthy to be called an Apostle, because I persecuted the Church of God." Yet there was a sense also that he was excusable, and that this was the reason why the mercy of God extended itself to him. "Yet I obtained mercy, because I did it ignorantly in unbelief." And in one passage he dwells on the fact, not only that he had been an Israelite, but more, that after the strictest sect of the Jews' religion he lived a Pharisee, as though that were an evidence to himself, and should be so to others, that no human power could have changed him; that he was no half Jew, who had never properly known what the law was, but one who had both known and strictly practised it.

We are apt to judge extraordinary men by our own standard; that is to say, we often suppose them to possess, in an extraordinary degree, those qualities which we are conscious of in ourselves or others. This is the easiest way of conceiving their characters, but not the truest. They differ in kind rather than in degree. Even to under-

stand them truly seems to require a power analogous to their own. Their natures are more subtle, and yet more simple, than we readily imagine. No one can read the ninth chapter of the First, or the eleventh and twelfth chapters of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, without feeling how different the Apostle St. Paul must have been from good men among ourselves. We marvel how such various traits of character come together in the same individual. He who was "full of visions and revelations of the Lord," who spake with tongues more than they all, was not "mad, but uttered the words of truth and soberness." He who was the most enthusiastic of all men, was also the most prudent; the Apostle of freedom and yet the most moderate. He who was the strongest and most enlightened of all men, was also (would he have himself refrained from saying?) at times the weakest; on whom there came the care of all the Churches, yet seeming also to lose the power of acting in the absence of human sympathy.

Qualities so like and unlike are hard to reconcile; perhaps they have never been united in the same degree in any other human being. The contradiction in part arises not only from the Apostle being an extraordinary man, but from his being a man like ourselves in an extraordinary state. Creation was not to him that fixed order of things which it is to us; rather it was an atmosphere of evil just broken by the light beyond. To us the repose of the scene around contrasts with the turmoil of man's own spirit; to the Apostle peace was to be sought only from within, half hidden even from the inner man. There was a veil upon the heart itself which had to be removed. He himself seemed to fall asunder at times into two parts, the flesh and the spirit; and the world to be divided into two hemispheres, the one of the rulers of darkness, the other bright with that inward presence which should one day be revealed. In this twilight he lived. What to us is far off both in time and place, if such an expression may be allowed, to him was near and present, separated by a thin film from the world we see, ever ready to break forth and gather into itself the frame of nature. That sense of the invisible which to most men it is so difficult to impart, was like a second nature to St. Paul. He walked by faith, and not by sight; what was strange to him was

the life he now led ; which in his own often repeated language was death rather than life, the place of shadows and not of realities. The Greek philosophers spoke of a world of phenomena, of true being, of knowledge, and opinion ; and we know that what they meant by these distinctions, is something different from the tenets of any philosophical school of the present day. But not less different is what St. Paul meant by the life hidden with Christ and God, the communion of the spirit, the possession of the mind of Christ ; only that this was not a mere difference of speculation, but of practice also. Could any one say now—"the life" not that I live, but that "Christ liveth in me" ? Such language with St. Paul is no mere phraseology, such as is repeated from habit in prayers, but the original consciousness of the Apostle respecting his own state. Self is banished from him, and has no more place in him, as he goes on his way to fulfil the work of Christ. No figure is too strong to express his humiliation in himself, or his exaltation in Christ.

Could we expect this to be otherwise when we look back at the manner of his conversion ? Could he have looked upon the world with the same eyes that we do, or heard its many voices with the same ears, who had been caught up into the seventh heaven, whether in the body or out of the body he could not tell ? Must not his whole life have seemed to him like a gradual revelation, an inspiration, an ecstasy ? Once he had looked upon the face of Christ, and heard Him speak from heaven. All that followed in the Apostle's history was continuous with that event, a stream of light flowing from it, "planting eyes" in his soul, transfiguring him "from glory to glory," clothing him with the elect "in the exceeding glory."

Yet this glory was not that of the princes of this world, "who come to nought;" it is another image which he gives us of himself;—not the figure on Mars' hill, in the cartoons of Raphael, nor the orator with noble mien and eloquent gesture before Festus and Agrippa ; but the image of one lowly and cast down, whose bodily presence was weak, and speech contemptible ; of one who must have appeared to the rest of mankind like a visionary, pierced by the thorn in the flesh, waiting for the redemption of the body. The saints of the middle ages are in many respects unlike St.

Paul, and yet many of them bear a far closer resemblance to him than is to be found in Luther and the Reformers. The points of resemblance which we seem to see in them, are the same withdrawal from the things of earth, the same ecstasy, the same consciousness of the person of Christ. Who would describe Luther by the words "crucified with Christ"? It is in another manner that the Reformer was called upon to war, with weapons earthly as well as spiritual, with a strong right hand and a mighty arm.

There have been those who, although deformed by nature, have worn the expression of a calm and heavenly beauty; in whom the flashing eye has attested the presence of thought in the poor withered and palsied frame. There have been others again, who have passed the greater part of their lives in intense bodily suffering, who have, nevertheless, directed states or led armies, the keenness of whose intellect has not been dulled, nor their natural force of mind abated. There have been those also, on whose faces men have gazed "as upon the face of an angel," while they pierced or stoned them. Of such an one, perhaps, the Apostle himself might have gloried; not of those whom men term great or noble. He who felt the whole creation groaning and travailing together until now, was not like the Greek drinking in the life of nature at every pore. He who through Christ was crucified to the world, and the world to him, was not in harmony with nature, nor nature with him. The manly form, the erect step, the fulness of life and beauty, could not have gone along with such a consciousness as this; any more than the taste for literature and art could have consisted with the thought, "not many wise, not many learned, not many mighty." Instead of these, we have the visage marred more than the sons of men, the cross of Christ to the Greeks foolishness, the thorn in the flesh, the marks in the body of the Lord Jesus.

Often the Apostle St. Paul has been described as a person the furthest removed from enthusiasm; incapable of spiritual illusion; by his natural temperament averse to credulity or superstition. By such considerations as these a celebrated author confesses himself to have been converted to the belief in Christianity. And yet, if it is intended to reduce St. Paul to the type of what is termed "good

sense" in the present day, it must be admitted, that the view which thus describes him is but partially true. Far nearer the truth is that other quaint notion of a modern writer, "that St. Paul was the finest gentleman that ever lived;" for no man had nobler forms of courtesy or a deeper regard for the feelings of others. But "good sense" is a term not well adapted to express either the individual, or the age and country in which he lived. He who wrought miracles, who had handkerchiefs carried to him from the sick, who spake with tongues more than they all, who lived amid visions and revelations of the Lord, who did not appeal to the Gospel as a thing long settled, but, himself, saw the process of revelation actually going on before his eyes, and communicated it to his fellow-men, could never have been such an one as ourselves. Nor can we pretend to estimate whether, in the modern sense of the term, he was capable of weighing evidence; or how far he would have attempted to sever between the workings of his own mind and the Spirit which was imparted to him.

What has given rise to this conception of the Apostle's character has been the circumstance, that with what the world terms mysticism and enthusiasm are united a singular prudence and moderation, and a perfect humanity, searching the feelings and knowing the hearts of all men. "I became all things to all men that I might win some;" not only, we may believe, as a sort of accommodation, but as the expression of the natural compassion and love which he felt for them. There is no reason to suppose that the Apostle took any interest in the daily life of men, in the great events which were befalling the Roman Empire, or in the temporal fortunes of the Jewish people. But when they came before him as sinners, lying in darkness and the shadow of God's wrath, ignorant of the mystery that was being revealed before their eyes, then his love was quickened for them, then they seemed to him as his kindred and brethren; there was no sacrifice too great for him to make; he was willing to die with Christ, yea, even to be accursed from Him that he might "save some of them."

Mysticism, or enthusiasm, or intense benevolence and philanthropy, seem to us, as they commonly are, at variance with worldly prudence and moderation. But in the Apostle these different and contrasted

qualities are mingled and harmonised. The mother watching over the life of her child, has all her faculties aroused and stimulated; she knows almost by instinct how to say or do the right thing at the right time; she regards his faults with mingled love and sorrow. So, in the Apostle, we seem to trace a sort of refinement or nicety of feeling, when he is dealing with the souls of men. All his knowledge of mankind shows itself for their sakes; and yet not that knowledge of mankind which comes from without, revealing itself by experience of men and manners, by taking a part in events, by the insensible course of years making us learn from what we have seen and suffered. There is another experience that comes from within, which begins with the knowledge of self, with the consciousness of our own weakness and infirmities; which is continued in love to others and in works of good to them; which grows by singleness and simplicity of heart. Love becomes the interpreter of how men think, and feel, and act, and supplies the place of, or passes into a worldly prudence wiser than the prudence of this world. Such is the worldly prudence of St. Paul.

Once more; there is in the Apostle, not only prudence and knowledge of the world, but a kind of subtilty of moderation, which considers every conceivable case, and balances one with another; in the last resort giving no rule, but allowing all to be superseded by a more general principle. An instance of this subtle moderation is his determination, or rather omission, to determine the question of meats and drinks, which he first regards as indifferent, secondly, as depending on men's own conscience, and this again as limited by the consciences of others, and lastly resolves all these finer precepts into the general principle, "Whatever ye do, do all to the glory of God." The same qualification of one principle by another recurs again in his rules respecting marriage. First, "do not marry unbelievers," and "let not the wife depart from her husband." But if you are married and the unbeliever is willing to remain, then the spirit of the second precept must prevail over the first. Only in an extreme case, where both parties are willing to dissolve the tie, the first principle in turn may again supersede the second. It may be said in the one case, "your children are holy;" in the other,

"What knowest thou, O wife, if thou shalt save thy husband?" In a similar spirit he withdraws his censure on the incestuous person, lest such an one, criminal as he was, should be swallowed up with overmuch sorrow. There is a religious aspect of either course of conduct, and either may be right under given circumstances. So the kingdoms of this world admit of being regarded almost as the kingdom of God, in reference to our duties towards their rulers; and yet touching the going to law before unbelievers, we are to think rather of that other kingdom in which we shall judge angels.

The Gospel, it has been often remarked, lays down principles rather than rules. The passages in the Epistles of St. Paul which seem to be exceptions to this statement, are exceptions in appearance rather than reality. They are relative to the circumstances of those whom he is addressing. He who became "all things to all men," would have been the last to insist on temporary regulations for his converts being made the rule of Christian life in all ages. His manner of Church government was the very reverse of an immutable and unbending law. In all his instructions to the Churches the Apostle is ever with them, and seems to follow in his mind's eye their working and effect; whither his Epistles go he goes in thought, absent, in his own language, in the body, but present in spirit. What he says to the Churches, he seems to make them say: what he directs them to do, they are to do in that common spirit in which they are united with him; if they live, he lives; time and distance never snap the cord of sympathy. His government of them is a sort of communion with them; a receiving of their feelings and a pouring forth of his own, hardly ever bare command; a spirit which he seeks to infuse into them, not a law by which he rules them.

Great men are sometimes said to possess the power of command, but not the power of entering into the feelings of others. They have no fear of their fellows, but neither are they always capable of immediately impressing them, or of perceiving the impression which their words or actions make upon them. Often they live in a kind of solitude on which other men do not venture to intrude; putting forth their strength on particular occasions, careless or abstracted about

the daily concerns of life. Such was not the greatness of the Apostle St. Paul; not only in the sense in which he says that "he could do all things through Christ," but in a more earthly and human one was it true, that his strength was his weakness and his weakness his strength. His dependence on others was in part also the source of his influence over them. His natural character was the type of that communion of the Spirit which he preached; the meanness of appearance which he attributes to himself, the image of that contrast which the Gospel presents to human greatness. Glorifying and humiliation, life and death, a vision of angels strengthening him, the "thorn in the flesh" rebuking him, the greatest tenderness not without sternness, sorrows above measure, consolations above measure, are some of the contradictions which were reconciled in the same man. The centre in which things so strange met and moved was the cross of Christ, "whose marks in his body he bore;" what was "behind of whose afflictions" he rejoiced to fill up. Let us look once more, a little closer, at that "visage marred" in his Master's service. A poor decrepit being, afflicted, perhaps, with palsy, certainly with some bodily defect,—led out of prison between Roman soldiers, probably at times faltering in his speech, the creature, as he seemed to spectators, of nervous sensibility; yearning, almost with a sort of fondness, to save the souls of those whom he saw around him,—spoke a few eloquent words in the cause of Christian truth, at which kings were awed, telling the tale of his own conversion with such simple pathos, that after ages have hardly heard the like.

Such is the image, not which Christian art has delighted to consecrate, but which the Apostle has left in his own writings of himself; an image of true wisdom and nobleness, and affection, but of a wisdom unlike the wisdom of this world; of a nobleness which must not be transformed into that of the heroes of the world; an affection which seemed to be as strong and as individual towards all mankind, as other men are capable of feeling towards a single person.

CHAP. V. VI.

IN the Third Section of the Epistle the Apostle proceeds to the practical application of the argument which has preceded:—"Ye are not the children of the bondwoman, but of the free: stand, therefore; with that freedom Christ has made you free." This is enforced by a further argument, that they who are under the law, are wholly under the law. The law and Christ, like the law and the promise, are mutually exclusive of each other. For the life of the Spirit, which is in Christ Jesus, has nothing to do with circumcision or uncircumcision; it is different in kind from either (1—6.).

The latter portion of nearly all the Epistles of St. Paul is remarkable for the abruptness of the style. The Apostle passes from one subject to another, dropping the intervening links by which they are associated in his own mind. New thoughts are suddenly introduced, and old ones unexpectedly come back again. His manner is that of a person speaking rather than writing. In the verses that follow (7—13.), the very sensitiveness of the Apostle seems to interfere with his power of connecting language. There was a time, he proceeds to say, when you acknowledged this; who has persuaded you to rebel? This rebellion of yours is not deeply rooted, however widely spread. It is the error of a few which leavens the mass. Looking forward in faith, I perceive that ye will hereafter be of one mind, and that the troublers of the Church shall themselves be the sufferers. And yet, brethren, when I think of their strange and inconsistent charges against myself, I cannot but feel indignant. Is it likely that they would persecute me if I still preached circumcision? And then, with a momentary feeling of disgust at the whole subject, he adds in irony:—Would that they would make themselves eunuchs who trouble you! That would indeed cut off the matter in dispute.

For your calling, brethren, has been very different from what they teach. It is a calling unto liberty, and the true means of liberty

is love. Howbeit, you show by your divisions that love is not the fulfilment of the law at which you aim.

All my precepts may be summed up in one:—"Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the lusts of the flesh." For there are two ways ; the way of the flesh, and the way of the Spirit : and these are contrary the one to the other, and their fruits are like them. We who are spiritual, should walk in the Spirit, remembering especially the duty of consideration of others, forgiving their offences and bearing their burdens. It is mere self-deception to think ourselves above this. Every man who tries himself will find he has a burden of his own. A particular instance of this duty of fellowship with others is the duty of supporting teachers, in which, as in all other Christian duties, we must be single and indefatigable, ready to do good to all men, and especially to members of the Church.

Look, says the Apostle, at the large and misshapen letters which I am tracing with mine own hand. A word more, and I have said enough. Those who would have you circumcised, act only on motives of expediency, to keep well with the Jewish Christians ; a proof of which is their own inconsistency in the observance of the law ; this shows they have no other object but to glory in you as their converts. But God forbid that I should glory in you, or in anything but that which is at the same time the symbol of humiliation, the cross of Christ. The question between them and me is indifferent compared with a change of heart. Peace be upon all who walk according to this rule !

Reverence me henceforth ; for I bear the person of Christ, and fill up the measure of His sufferings. The grace of Christ be with your spirit.

τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ¹ ἡμᾶς χριστὸς ἡλευθέρωσεν. στήκετε οὖν², 5
καὶ μὴ πάλιν ζυγῷ δουλείας ἐνέχεσθε.

* Ἴδε ἐγὼ Παῦλος λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι ἐὰν περιτέμνησθε, χρι- 2
στὸς ὑμᾶς οὐδὲν ὠφελήσει· μαρτύρομαι δὲ πάλιν παντὶ 3

¹ Add οὖν ᾤ.

² Om. οὖν.

V. Most of St. Paul's Epistles, as the Romans, Colossians, Ephesians, and Thessalonians, may be divided into two portions; one doctrinal or personal, the other practical and hortatory. The latter of these portions commences, in the Epistle to the Galatians, with the present chapter. Yet here, too, the thread of the doctrinal portion often reappears, as in v. 17, 18., vi. 15.

The main subject of the Epistle has been "the liberty of the Gospel." No terms can be too strong to express its value; it is impossible to exaggerate the danger of yielding the least point which in principle involves the whole. But then, as in the Romans, a protest is introduced against continuing in sin that grace may abound; so here the same thought occurs in the form of a fear lest this liberty become a cloak of licentiousness. Freedom from the law is good, but this freedom must be also in a higher sense a fulfilment of the law in love. That fulfilment of the law is given by the Spirit, which leads not merely to a barren abstraction of freedom, but to walking in the Spirit, and bringing forth the works of the spirit. As in Rom. viii. 5. 16., the Apostle draws out the nature of the Spirit, in contrast with the flesh.

1. There is great variation of reading in this verse. The principal differences are those adopted

into their respective editions by Lachmann and Tischendorf:—
τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ ᾧ ἡμᾶς χριστὸς ἡλευθέρωσεν στήκετε, καὶ μὴ πάλιν ζυγῷ δουλείας ἐνέχεσθε. Tisch.; and τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ ἡμᾶς χριστὸς ἡλευθέρωσεν. στήκετε οὖν καὶ μὴ πάλιν ζυγῷ δουλείας ἐνέχεσθε. Lachmann; out of the confusion of which the common reading appears to have arisen, which places the οὖν after ἐλευθερίᾳ. Lachmann's reading is the more spirited, though not wholly free from objections, the greatest being the use of the cognate word after ἡλευθέρωσεν, without an adjective. This might be avoided by taking τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ in close connexion with the preceding verse, "With this liberty Christ made us free."

στήκετε οὖν καὶ μὴ πάλιν, κ.τ.λ., *Stand therefore, and be not again entangled with the yoke of bondage.*] Why "again"? Because they had been under the law previously, though whether as proselytes or Jewish Christians, as we only know of this previous state from the allusions of the Apostle, is uncertain. We cannot suppose that either here or at iii. 9. St. Paul uses these expressions merely from a warmth of temperament, which makes him speak from his own point of view rather than that of his converts. There was an analogy between the prior state of Jew and Gentile, but there is no proof that the Apostle regarded both as

5 With that freedom Christ hath made us free. Stand fast therefore, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage.¹

2 Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circum-
3 cised, Christ shall profit you nothing. And* I testify

¹ Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free.

under one previous dispensation of the law.

2. *Ἰδε ἐγὼ Παῦλος λέγω ὑμῖν.*] The Apostle repeats his own name, as an expression of his intimate and personal conviction. He is pleading with them rather than "lording" it over them.

ὅτι ἐὰν περιτέμνησθε, ὅτι if ye be circumcised.] Christ and circumcision are opposed to each other as Christ and the law. I tell you that you cannot rely on Christ and on external ordinances at the same time. To be one with Christ is the denial and negative, not merely of sins of the flesh, but of the sense of external obligation, and the consciousness of sin itself.

3. *μαρτύρομαι δέ, and I testify.*] In the same earnest tone the Apostle proceeds to urge the argument from consistency. If the Gentiles compel themselves "to live as do the Jews," they must do so wholly. Now, circumcision was the sign and pledge that they would obey the law. It was to the Jew what baptism was to the believer,—an anticipation of his reception into the Covenant, and this was a falling away from Christ. Or, if we take the words more generally, and omit the further allusion,—the performing of a single point of the law implied the principle of obedience to the law, and in practice was liable to lead to it. Obedience to the law

could not coexist with the principle of salvation through Christ, which did not by any means remit obedience, but required an obedience of a higher and different kind.

In other passages, the Apostle exhorts men to overlook lesser differences; the eating of meat or herbs, the observance of days, the eating of meats offered to idols, Rom. xiv. In such cases we are to follow the double rule of faith and charity; to have no scruples ourselves, yet to be tender to those of others, lest in things even indifferent we should do violence to their consciences, and in the end to our own. But there are cases in which it is equally important to yield nothing, because the very least concession implies everything. "I will eat no meat as long as the world standeth, lest I make my brother to offend," has to be balanced and modified by the other principle,—*"I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to keep the whole law."* And the Spirit of both must be further regulated by the words which follow: *"Neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but faith which worketh by love."* It is true, we cannot always tolerate intolerance, or always treat those things as indifferent which really are so, when they accidentally become of importance.

ἀνθρώπῳ περιτεμνομένῳ ὅτι ὀφειλέτης ἐστὶν ὅλον τὸν νόμον
ποιῆσαι. κατηργήθητε ἀπὸ ¹ χριστοῦ, οἷτινες ἐν νόμῳ δι- 4
καιούσθε, τῆς χάριτος ἐξεπέσατε. ἡμεῖς γὰρ πνεύματι ἐκ 5
πίστεως ἐλπίδα δικαιοσύνης ἀπεκδεχόμεθα· ἐν γὰρ χριστῷ 6
Ἰησοῦ οὔτε περιτομή τι ἰσχύει οὔτε ἀκροβυστία, ἀλλὰ
πίστις δι' ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη.

Ἐτρέχετε καλῶς· τίς ὑμᾶς ἐνέκοψεν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ μὴ πεί- 7
θεσθαι; ἡ πεισμονὴ οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ καλοῦντος ὑμᾶς. μικρά ⁸
ζύμη ὅλον τὸ φύραμα ζυμοῖ. ἐγὼ [δὲ] ² πέποιθα εἰς ὑμᾶς 10

¹ Add τοῦ.² Om. δέ.

δέ is adversative, not to the preceding verse, but to the doctrine which the Apostle is opposing, the implied answer of his antagonist.

3. πάλιν] referring to the preceding verse; see also iii. 10.

περιτεμνομένῳ.] "Who is being circumcised;" or, who "is about being circumcised."

4. καταργεῖν, in its original meaning, signifies to annul or do away with; and hence with ἀπό, to destroy or annul the connexion of two things. Comp. iii. 17.; Rom. vii. 2—6.

δικαιούσθε]=who are justified by the law.

τῆς χάριτος ἐξεπέσατε] does not imply that they once stood in grace and are now fallen from it, but only "have fallen away from grace,"—the passing out of a state.

5. It is a fiction of interpreters to say that γάρ is here put for δέ. St. Paul could not have meant by γάρ, "but our case is different." γάρ truly expresses the reason of what preceded, regarded from a peculiar point of view. "For we, the true believers, are different from you, and look for the hope of righteousness through faith." The

harshness of the ellipse may be further softened by supposing πνεύματι to correspond to σαρκί or some similar expression understood in the preceding verses. For a similar use of γάρ in contrast, comp. Rom. i. 18.

πνεύματι, by the Spirit.] The Spirit is the communion of the Spirit of God, of which all are partakers, as faith is the link by which we connect this new spirit with ourselves. The former is universal, without and within us at once; the latter, within us only. ἐλπίδα ἀπεκδεχόμεθα may either be regarded as a pleonasm for ἐπιζόμεν, and the kingdom of God be denoted by the single word righteousness. "We patiently hope for righteousness;" or, "We wait for the hope that righteousness has of the life to come."

6. ἐν γὰρ χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.] The connexion of this verse is made by πίστις, which refers to ἐκ πίστεως in the preceding. For we by faith wait for the hope of righteousness; for, with the believer who dwells in Christ, it is faith only that avails, and not circumcision or uncircumcision. Comp. vi. 15. The train of

again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a
 4 debtor to do the whole law. Christ is become of no
 effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the
 5 law; ye are fallen from grace. For we through the
 6 Spirit wait for the hope of righteousness by faith. For
 in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth any thing,
 nor uncircumcision; but faith which worketh by love.
 7 Ye did run well; who did hinder you that ye should
 8 not obey the truth? This persuasion cometh not of
 9 him that calleth you. A little leaven leaveneth the whole
 10 lump. Howbeit* I have confidence in you through the

thought is slightly obscured by the Apostle, as his manner is, having first expressed negatively what he afterwards expresses positively.

6. *πίστις δι' ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη.*] Faith, which is the opposite of the law, comes round through love, to be the fulfilment of it, both to God and man. There is no point in which St. Paul would so little have coincided with Luther, as in the latter's denial of the connexion between them. The faith of St. Paul is not opposed to internal qualities, but to external states and acts. Even the notion of faith being the mean or entrance to all other virtues, is not found in his writings.

7. *Ἐτρέχετε καλῶς.*] The Apostle proceeds in a mixed tone of censure and praise:—"You were running well, who is it that has hindered (*ἐνέκοψεν*) you? or who has stricken you back (*ἀνέκοψε*) that you should not obey the truth?" As though he said:—"I once thought well of you, but you are not what you were. I cannot account for this change;

it is not natural to you; there is some one at the bottom of it."

8. *ἐκ τοῦ καλοῦντος.*] Not the Apostle, but God, who in the language of St. Paul is always spoken of as "the caller." Comp. i. 6.

9. *μικρὰ ζύμη, a little leaven.*] A proverbial expression, which occurs also 1 Cor. v. 6. and forms in St. Luke, xiii. 21., the groundwork of a parable of our Lord. This passage admits of various explanations. "A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump;" that is, a little evil gradually spreads universal corruption. The minute point of circumcision involves the obligation of the whole law; the false teachers, though few in number and insignificant in influence, are yet drawing after them the whole Church. The latter thought is more in accordance with the connexion of the following and preceding verse.

10. *ἐγὼ [δὲ] πέποιθα εἰς ὑμᾶς, but I am confident.*] These words, whether with or without *δέ*, form an antithesis to the preceding. A few persons work great evil in a community; but I

ἐν κυρίῳ, ὅτι οὐδὲν ἄλλο φρονήσετε· ὁ δὲ ταρασσὼν ὑμᾶς
 βαστάσει τὸ κρίμα, ὅστις ἂν ᾖ. ἐγὼ δέ, ἀδελφοί, εἰ περι- 11
 τομὴν ἔτι κηρύσσω, τί ἔτι διώκομαι; ἄρα κατήγγηται τὸ
 σκάνδαλον τοῦ σταυροῦ. ὅφελον καὶ ἀποκόψονται οἱ ἀνα- 12
 στατοῦντες ὑμᾶς.

am confident in you that ye will not change. Such is the hope or aspiration of the Apostle, hoping almost against hope, if we may judge from his previous language. *πέποιθα ἐν θεῷ* has been translated, "I put my trust in God." This however, hardly expresses the subtilty of the language. He adds *ἐν κυρίῳ* after *πέποιθα* in the same way as after *λέγω*, or any other word, all acts of the Christian being described as done in God and Christ.

οὐδὲν ἄλλο φρονήσετε, you will not change your mind,] i. e. notwithstanding the efforts of the false teachers.

ὁ δὲ ταρασσὼν ὑμᾶς βαστάσει τὸ κρίμα.] Above we had the plural (1—7.); here, the singular, possibly in reference to a particular individual who was known to the Apostle, and whom he designates contemptuously as *ὅστις ἂν ᾖ*. Comp. *ὅποιοί ποτε ἦσαν*, in chap. ii. 6. I am confident in you,—the false teachers I leave to God; they shall be punished in the day of visitation.

11. *ἐγὼ δέ, ἀδελφοί.*] It is clear from this verse that St. Paul himself had been charged with inconsistency in preaching circumcision. As he had said to Peter, "If thou, being a Jew, livest as do the Gentiles;" so the accusation had been brought against him, "If thou being an Apostle of the Gentiles, art circumcised, and allowedst Timothy

to be circumcised, and shavest thy head for a vow after the manner of the Jews, why dost thou declare circumcision and the law unnecessary which thou thyself practisest?" Such a charge would only be his enemies' mode of expressing what he has in other words expressed himself, that to the Jews he became as a Jew, that he might gain the Jews. Comp. vi. 13.

A difficulty, however, remains respecting the connexion of this verse with the preceding. Two trains of thought appear to meet in it: first, Why am I persecuted? but secondly, My persecution is a disproof of the charge that I yet preach circumcision. In the last verse it is declared that the troubler shall bear his burden; that suggests the thought, "Why should I bear a burden?" Still we have to seek a connexion for the words, "if I preach circumcision," which it has been suggested might be given, by supposing that this very charge was brought by the person of whom he has been speaking. It is better to leave the connexion than to seek to find one in suppositions which can neither be proved nor disproved. *ἔτι* may refer to the form in which the Galatians brought their charge against him: "You still preach circumcision yourself." Inaccurately as the words may have been used, they seem to imply a reference not denied by

Lord, that ye will be none otherwise minded: but he that troubleth you shall bear his judgment, whosoever
¹¹ he be. But I, brethren, if I yet preach circumcision, why do I yet suffer persecution? then is the offence of
¹² the cross ceased. I would that they would even cut off their* members which trouble you.

himself, to a time when the tone of his preaching or practice had been different, that time alluded to by him in another enigmatical expression, "when he knew Christ only according to the flesh." Compare introduction to 1 Thessalonians.

ἀρα κατήγγηται τὸ σκάνδαλον τοῦ σταυροῦ] may be read without difference of meaning, either with or without a question. It is observable that, not Christ Himself, but the cross of Christ, is spoken of as the peculiar object of Jewish hatred. It is sometimes remarked, that to the pride of the Pharisee the doctrine of the cross would be peculiarly intolerable; it was foolishness also "to the Greek." This, however, does not explain how the cross of Christ should have become the especial symbol of the disciples of St. Paul, and not, like the name of Christ, have been common to Jewish, as well as Gentile Christians. The reason seems to be, that it was the symbol of that Gospel which was most opposed to the belief in a Jewish Messiah; that Gospel which was preached by St. Paul among the Gentiles. Even in St. John there are not many allusions to the cross or to the death of Christ, in comparison with the allusions to His birth and life. The Word becoming flesh is the great theme; not the

doctrine of the cross, which is spoken of as a sign rather of the exaltation of Christ than of His humiliation. "As Moses lifted up the serpent," &c. And, "I, if I be lifted up from the earth, shall draw all men after me." It is otherwise with St. Paul; that which expresses his innermost feeling respecting the truth, which most perfectly describes the contrast of the Gospel with the world, which is the most complete condemnation of the law, which seems also to be the figure or rather the reality of his own suffering state, is—the cross of Christ.

12. ὄφελον καὶ ἀποκοφόνται.] Would that they would make themselves eunuchs who trouble you; that they were not only circumcised, but that they were so that the question of circumcision could have no relation to them! Such is the common interpretation of the Fathers, confirmed by the use of language in the LXX. and not to be rejected only because it is displeasing to the delicacy of modern times. The authorised translation fails—(1.) in giving a passive sense to the middle form; and (2.) in the meaning which it assigns to the verb, which, though a literal translation of ἀποκόπτειν, is here used in a different sense from that in which the word "cut

Ἑμεῖς γὰρ ἐπ' ἐλευθερίᾳ ἐκλήθητε, ἀδελφοί· μόνον μὴ¹ 13
τὴν ἐλευθερίαν εἰς ἀφορμὴν τῇ σαρκί, ἀλλὰ διὰ τῆς ἀγάπης
δουλεύετε ἀλλήλοις. ὁ γὰρ πᾶς νόμος ἐν ἐνὶ λόγῳ πεπλή- 14
ρωται¹, ἐν τῷ Ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν. εἰ 15
δὲ ἀλλήλους δάκνετε καὶ κατεσθίετε, βλέπετε μὴ ὑπ' ἀλλή-
λων ἀναλωθῇτε.

Λέγω δέ, πνεύματι περιπατεῖτε, καὶ ἐπιθυμίαν σαρκὸς οὐ 16
μὴ τελέσητε. ἡ γὰρ σὰρξ ἐπιθυμεῖ κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος, τὸ 17
δὲ πνεῦμα κατὰ τῆς σαρκὸς· ταῦτα γὰρ² ἀλλήλοις ἀντίκει-
ται, ἵνα μὴ ἂ [ἐὰν]³ θέλητε, ταῦτα ποιῇτε. εἰ δὲ πνεύματι 18

¹ πληροῦται.² δέ.³ ἂν.

off" is the interpretation of the Greek.

13. Ἑμεῖς γὰρ ἐπ' ἐλευθερίᾳ ἐκλήθητε.] For a moment the style changes from passionate exhortation to argument:—"For the Gospel which they preach is very different from the Gospel of freedom whereunto ye are called; ἐπί, as elsewhere, without distinction of the condition and object.

The freedom of the Gospel implies—(1.) the freedom from the burden of ordinances; (2.) from the consciousness of sin; (3.) it implies also, the communion of the Spirit,—“Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty.”

μόνον μὴ τὴν ἐλευθερίαν εἰς ἀφορμὴν.] Yet remember that there is a liberty to which you are not called, which is the freedom of the flesh. Your liberty is also a service, the service to one another through love.

In the Epistle to the Romans, the Gospel is spoken of as the law of the Spirit of life; a similar turn is here given to the freedom of the Gospel, which may be looked

on in a different light as a service also. Comp. Rom. vi. 22.:—"When ye were freed from sin, ye were made the servants of righteousness." The best way of explaining the construction is to take τὴν ἐλευθερίαν as an accusative in apposition with the previous sentence: = that calling unto liberty.

14. Let not your liberty be an occasion to the flesh, but a service to each other. For the whole law is but the fulfilment of the single precept—"Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself."

The law had been the great source of disputes and divisions in the early Church; and yet what was the law?—nothing more than the command of brotherly love. Here again we have an inversion of the natural order of things; the law is presented under a new aspect, the very contradictory of that which Jews and Jewish Christians had given to it.

15. But if ye bite and devour each other, see whether this must not end in your mutual destruc-

- 13 For, brethren, ye have been called unto liberty; only
 use not your * liberty for an occasion to the flesh, but
 14 by love serve one another. For all the law is fulfilled
 in one word, even in this; Thou shalt love thy neigh-
 15 bour as thyself. But if ye bite and devour one another,
 take heed that ye be not consumed one of another.
 16 Now * I say then, Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall
 17 not fulfil the lust of the flesh. For the flesh lusteth
 against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh; for¹
 these are contrary the one to the other: so that ye
 18 may* not do the things that ye would. But if ye be led

¹ And.

tion, the very contrary of the purpose for which the law was given. Another interpretation—"I fear lest you lose altogether the doctrine of Christ," seems far-fetched and inappropriate to the connexion.

16. St. Paul proceeds to view the question more generally and less personally, and seems to pass from the flesh as the seat of the Jewish dispensation, to the flesh as the source of all impurity. As in Rom. viii. 4., those who walk according to the flesh are opposed to those who walk according to the Spirit, so here the life of the Spirit is dwelt upon as that which extinguishes and prevents our carrying into act the desire of the flesh.

17. Compare Rom. vii. 15—20. For the flesh and the Spirit are opposed to each other, the design of which is to prevent you from doing as you would.

It seems strange at first sight, to say that the flesh and the Spirit are opposed to each other by design, and we feel more in-

clined to imagine that this is one of those passages in which *ἵνα* is used to denote result rather than design. But the strict grammatical sense appears also most in accordance with the view of St. Paul, who regards the strife of the flesh and the Spirit as preconcerted by Providence to pave the way for the reception of the truth.

ἵνα μὴ ἂ [ἐάν] θελήτε, ταῦτα ποιῆτε.] As in Rom. vii., St. Paul is speaking of the struggle of human nature with itself,—“the things that I would not in my better nature, those I do.”

18. The key to this verse is again given by Rom. vii. The state which the Apostle has just been describing, is that which he there explains as the state of those under the law. From doing the things they would not men are delivered by the guidance of the Spirit,—“the law of the Spirit of life makes them free from the law of sin and death,”—that death which is the last state of spiritual discord.

ἄγεσθε, οὐκ ἐστὲ ὑπὸ νόμον. φανερὰ δέ ἐστιν τὰ ἔργα τῆς 19
σαρκός, αἳ τινὰ ἐστίν,¹ πορνεία ἀκαθαρσία ἀσέλγεια εἰδωλο- 20
λατρεία φαρμακεία ἔχθραι ἔρις ζῆλος² θυμοὶ ἐριθειαὶ διχο-
στασίαι αἰρέσεις φθόνοι [φόνοι] μέθαι κῶμοι καὶ τὰ ὅμοια 21
τούτοις· ἃ προλέγω ὑμῖν καθὼς [καὶ] προεῖπον, ὅτι οἱ
τὰ τοιαῦτα πράσσοντες βασιλείαν θεοῦ οὐ κληρονομή-
σουσιν. ὁ δὲ καρπὸς τοῦ πνεύματός ἐστιν ἀγάπη χαρὰ 22
εἰρήνη μακροθυμία χρηστότης ἀγαθωσύνη πίστις πραΰ- 23
της ἐγκράτεια· κατὰ τῶν τοιούτων οὐκ ἔστιν νόμος. οἱ 24

¹ Add *μοιχεία*.² *ἐρις* ζῆλος.

19. Two classes of sins are included under the term "sins of the flesh," corresponding to the division of *θυμός* and *ἐπιθυμία* in the Greek philosophy, or more appropriately to the two meanings of *σάρξ*, as the symbol of the Jewish dispensation, and the seat of human passions. They are—first, divisions; secondly, sins of impurity.

πορνεία is used in the New Testament—(1.) for fornication, 1 Cor. vi. 13. 18.; also, (2.) for incest, 1 Cor. v. i. As marriage is the symbol of the Church, so in the New Testament, there is a mystery of iniquity in sins of impurity which in a certain sense is a sin against the Holy Ghost who sanctifies the body.

[*μοιχεία*, which occurs in one or two MSS. of inferior note, as the first in this list of sins, as also *φόνοι* in ver. 21., is spurious.]

For similar lists of sins comp. Rom. i. 29.; Matt. xvi. 9.; Mark, vii. 21. The order in which they are arranged seems to arise partly out of a connexion of thought, partly from similarity of sound and termination.

ἀκαθαρσία] is commonly used

in the New Testament for the impurity of lust, but in one passage, 1 Thess. ii. 3. (compare ver. 5.), apparently for impurity in the other sense of "interested motives," thus affording a curious parallel to the converse change of meaning in the word *πλεονεξία*. It occurs in a general sense in Dem. con. Meidiam, 553. 13. for "baseness," or "foulness."

ἀσέλγεια] passes through a change of meaning answering to the two senses of the English word wantonness, from outrageousness, excess, in earlier Greek [prob. from *α* and *ἑλγω*], to lewdness and lasciviousness in Polybius and the Greek Testament, in which latter, however, the primary meaning is also retained.

20. *εἰδωλολατρεία*] is used in its proper sense in 1 Cor. x. 7., yet also in that metaphorical one in which we speak of making riches, children, &c., idols, in Eph. v. 5.; Col. iii. 5. *πλεονεξία ἥτις ἐστὶν εἰδωλολατρεία*, where the juxtaposition of the two words is remarkable as a proof of the genuineness of the two Epistles, occurring as it does again in 1 Cor. v. 11.—

19 of the Spirit, ye are not under the law. Now the works
 of the flesh are manifest, which are these; ¹ fornication,
 20 uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred,
 variance, emulation², wrath, strife, seditions, heresies,
 21 envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such
 like: of the which I tell you before, as I have also
 told you in time past, that they which do such
 22 things shall not inherit the kingdom of God. But the
 fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, longsuffering,
 23 gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance:
 24 against such there is no law. And they that are

¹ Add adultery.² Emulations

πλεονέκτης ἢ ἐδωολάτρης, in a different form.

φαρμακεία,] like *veneficium* in Latin, seems to be here used for witchcraft, as commonly in the Old Testament.

ἐριθεία,] See on Rom. ii. 8.

διχοστασίαι and αἰρέσεις,] Divisions—(1.) in reference to their outward effect; (2.) to the inward feeling from which they spring.

21. [φόνοι, which is omitted in B. and in Irenæus, Cyprian, and Jerome, has probably arisen from the resemblance of the preceding word.]

προεῖπον,] as I told you while I was yet with you. Comp. 2 Thess. ii. 5.

βασιλείαν Θεοῦ οὐ κληρονομήσουσιν,] The same expression occurs in 1 Cor. v. 9, 10, xv. 50. "Flesh and blood shall not inherit the kingdom of God." Where, as in this passage, it must be taken for the kingdom of Christ in the resurrection.

22. ὁ δὲ καρπός,] applied more naturally, though not exclusively,

in a good sense. Compare Matt. vii. 18.

χαρά,] Comp. Rom. xii. 15. :—χαίρειν μετὰ χαρόντων. Joy or light-heartedness is, in itself, a Christian duty; it may be regarded as a higher degree of peace, not unconnected with that "glorying in the Lord" of which the Apostle elsewhere speaks. Gal. vi. 14., &c.

εἰρήνη,] opposed to ἔχθραι, ἔρις, ζῆλος, and therefore primarily signifying peace with man, from which, however, peace towards God is inseparable.

χρηστότης,] is used in the New Testament for goodness, in the sense of kindness or mercy, whether of God or man.

ἀγαθωσύνη,] may be distinguished from *χρηστότης*, as goodness in the sense of probity from the above.

πίστις,] As in 1 Cor. xii. 9., 2 Tim. ii. 22., faith is here used, not for the door of all virtues, but for a particular virtue.

23. κατὰ τῶν τοιούτων,] may be either masculine or neuter. If the

δὲ τοῦ χριστοῦ [Ἰησοῦ] τὴν σάρκα ἐσταύρωσαν σὺν
 τοῖς παθήμασιν καὶ ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις. εἰ ζῶμεν πνεύ- 25
 ματι, πνεύματι καὶ στοιχῶμεν. μὴ γινώμεθα κενό- 26
 δοξοι, ἀλλήλους ¹ προκαλούμενοι, ἀλλήλους φθονοῦντες.

¹ ἀλλήλοις.

latter, the construction is more regular, although what is gained in regularity is more than lost by the want of point in saying, "Against love &c. there is no law."

οὐκ ἔστιν νόμος.] "The law is not made for a righteous man." 1 Tim. i. 9. It neither prohibits nor enjoins Christian graces, which belong to a different sphere.

24. In the preceding verses the Apostle has been speaking of the opposition between the works of the flesh and the fruit of the Spirit. He adds, "But they that are Christ's have crucified the flesh," to which, without any connecting or adversative particle, the next verse answers,—“If we come under this class; if we live not by the flesh but by the Spirit,

Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections
 25 and lusts. If we live in the Spirit, let us also
 walk in the Spirit. Let us not be desirous of vain
 26 glory, provoking one another, envying one another.

let us walk by the guidance of the Spirit." As in the Romans he says: — "If ye be Christ's, the body is dead because of sin, but the Spirit is life because of righteousness." Ver. 24. corresponds to ver. 19 — 21., as ver. 25. to ver. 22. and 23.

25. στοιχεῖν,] like περιπατεῖν, refers to "way of life."

πνεύματι.] By the helps of the Spirit: the instrumental sense of

the dative is lost in a more general one.

26. Let us not be vainglorious, provoking one another, envying one another.

This, and the precepts that follow to the end of ver. 6. of the following chapter, are illustrations of the walk of the Spirit. What they enjoin is the very contrary of the works of the flesh spoken of above.

ἀδελφοί, ἐὰν καὶ προλημφθῇ ἄνθρωπος ἐν τινι παρὰ 6
 πτώματι, ὑμεῖς οἱ πνευματικοὶ καταρτίζετε τὸν τοιοῦτον
 ἐν πνεύματι πραότητος. σκοπῶν σεαυτόν, μὴ καὶ σὺ
 πειρασθῆς, ἀλλήλων τὰ βάρη βαστάζετε, καὶ οὕτως 2
 ἀναπληρώσετε¹ τὸν νόμον τοῦ χριστοῦ. εἰ γὰρ δοκεῖ 3
 τις εἶναι τι μηδὲν ὦν, φρεναπατᾷ ἑαυτόν². τὸ δὲ ἔργον 4
 ἑαυτοῦ δοκιμαζέτω ἕκαστος, καὶ τότε εἰς ἑαυτὸν μόνον τὸ

¹ ἀναπληρώσατε.² ἑαυτὸν φρεναπατᾷ.

VI. The connexion of ver. 1—10. with each other, and with what precedes, is at first sight obscure. The Apostle has been contrasting the works of the flesh with those of the Spirit. At ver. 25. of the preceding chapter, he adds the exhortation:—"As we are spiritual, let us be spiritual in our life and conversation." From this general text he diverges to particular precepts; the first against vainglorying, then of the duty of the spiritually minded towards an erring brother, then of bearing one another's burdens, then of thinking lowly of self, of trying one's life and actions, of keeping glorying to one's self; next comes the thought that we all have our burdens to bear, then the duty of supporting ministers of the word, then of doing good to all and especially to the household of faith. These various and apparently disjointed thoughts are not, however, unconnected in the Apostle's mind.

First, the absence of vainglorying is really connected with a merciful judgment of the sins and mistakes of others. When a man feels the possibility that he may err himself, he is far more ready to restore others. And the same spirit which inclines us to a lenient judgment of others, leads us also to bear with

the infirmities and weaknesses of others. The great delusion which impedes this, it is again repeated, is conceit of self. The words of the Pharisee,—"God, I thank thee, that I am not as other men are," lead naturally to the disdainful feeling—"nor even as this publican." But if a man will try himself, he will find that he too has his cross and burden, and will lay aside his self-importance, and seek to identify himself with others. In what follows, the Apostle seems to invert the natural order; instead of saying,—“Let us do good to all men,” and so going on to the particular, he begins with a particular case of doing good, the duty of supporting ministers, and concludes with the general precept.

προλημφθῇ,] not “even if a man be taken in a fault before;” or “not for the first time;” still less, “if a man be taken in a fault before this Epistle reach you;” but as in the English translation, “If a man be overtaken in a fault:” καὶ is opposed to what has preceded. Not only do not envy one another, but even if a man have done wrong, treat him in a Christian spirit. The word προλημφθῇ anticipates the feeling with which he is to be regarded.

ὑμεῖς οἱ πνευματικοί,] “Ye who

- 6 Brethren, if a man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spiritual, restore such an one in the spirit of meekness; considering thyself, lest thou also be tempted.
 2 Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfil¹ the law of
 3 Christ. For if a man think himself to be something,
 4 when he is nothing, he deceiveth himself. But let every man prove his own work, and then shall he have

¹ Shall ye fulfil.

are spiritual," opposed to *σαρκικοί*. Ye who know the truths of the Gospel, and are freed from the law, and live in communion with God and Christ. Spirituality implies a nature at one with other men, and also with itself; it includes moral virtues, in proportion as it becomes divided from them, passing into an unmeaning enthusiasm or ecstasy; it is here particularised as the spirit of meekness.

σκοπῶν σεαυτόν, μὴ καὶ σὺ πειρασθῇς.] There is no good reason for Lachmann's punctuation, who connects these words with the succeeding verse to which they are not so appropriate as to that which follows. It is more after the manner of St. Paul to end than to begin sentences with a participial clause.

2. ἀλλήλων τὰ βάρη βαστάζετε.] So in Rom. xv. 1.:—"We that are strong ought to bear the infirmities of them that are weak." In the Epistle to the Romans, peculiarities of opinion and inclinations to Jewish observances are chiefly intended; here, faults and weaknesses of character, all those things which try others in our intercourse with them.

καὶ οὕτως ἀναπληρώσατε τὸν νόμον τοῦ χριστοῦ.] It has been suggested that by the law of Christ is meant the new commandment,—“to love

one another." This is the language of St. John, not of St. Paul. Rather *ὁ νόμος τοῦ χριστοῦ* refers to Christ himself bearing our infirmities. Comp. Matt. viii. 17.—*οὗτος τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν ἀνέλαβε καὶ τὰς νόσους ἐξέστανεν.* It might be paraphrased by “the law of the cross of Christ.” It is an expression of the same kind with “the law of the Spirit of life,” where the meaning of the word “law” is self-contradicted. The law of Christ includes many associations. “The law which Christ fulfilled, which he enjoins his disciples to fulfil; the law, not of Moses, but of Christ; not old, but new.”

εἰ γάρ.] The connexion implied by *γάρ* may be paraphrased as follows:—“Bear one another's burdens, even as Christ bore your burdens; for that opinion of self which will not suffer a man to stoop to this, is mere self-deception.

A similar transition of thought occurs also in Phil. ii. 3, 4. “Let nothing be done through strife or vainglory; but in lowliness of mind let each esteem other better than themselves. Look not every man on his own things, but every man also on the things of others.”

4. If a man will get a little more self-knowledge, and see

καύχημα ἔξει, καὶ οὐκ εἰς τὸν ἕτερον· ἕκαστος γὰρ τὸ ἴδιον 5
φορτίον βαστάσει. κοινωνεῖτω δὲ ὁ κατηχούμενος τὸν 6
λόγον τῷ κατηχούντι ἐν πάσιν ἀγαθοῖς. μὴ πλανᾶσθε, 7
θεὸς οὐ μυκτηρίζεται. ὁ γὰρ ἄν¹ σπείρη ἄνθρωπος, τοῦτο
καὶ θερίσει· ὅτι ὁ σπείρων εἰς τὴν σάρκα ἑαυτοῦ ἐκ τῆς 8
σαρκὸς θερίσει φθοράν, ὁ δὲ σπείρων εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα ἐκ τοῦ
πνεύματος θερίσει ζωὴν αἰώνιον. τὸ δὲ καλὸν ποιοῦντες 9
μὴ ἐγκακῶμεν· καιρῷ γὰρ ἰδίῳ θερίσομεν μὴ ἐκλυόμενοι.
ἄρα οὖν ὡς καιρὸν ἔχομεν ἐργαζώμεθα τὸ ἀγαθὸν πρὸς 10
πάντας, μάλιστα δὲ πρὸς τοὺς οἰκείους τῆς πίστεως.

*Ἴδετε πηλίκους ὑμῶν γράμμασιν ἔγραψα τῇ ἐμῇ χειρὶ. 11

¹ ἑάν.

himself truly as he is, he will feel no inclination to glory, but will keep his own praises to himself.

ἐαυτοῦ,] as opposed to others.
5. ἕκαστος γὰρ τὸ ἴδιον φορτίον βαστάσει.] For every one will have to bear his own burden. γὰρ expresses the reason, not merely of the preceding clause, but of the whole previous passage. "Bear one another's burdens, for every one will have a burden of his own to bear;" just as it was said above, "Restore an erring brother, for it may be your turn to err too." In addition to this there is a slighter thread of connexion in ver. 4, 5. between the words, εἰς ἑαυτόν and ἴδιον. When a man looks into himself, he will keep to himself; for he will find within, or without going abroad, proper to him (ἴδιον) a sufficient burden.

6. κοινωνεῖτω δέ.] The connexion, as already observed, is obscure. The Apostle was passing on in his mind to speak generally of duties towards others, when, seemingly by a sudden impulse, he lights on a particular point.

As though he said, And now I am speaking of those duties which make us members one of another, let me remind you of the debt you owe to your ministers. That such is the Apostle's meaning, notwithstanding its seeming inconsistency with parts of the Epistle is clear—(α) from the mention of κατηχῶν and κατηχούμενος; (β) from the same precept occurring in 1 Cor. ix. 11., and with a similar context, "He which soweth sparingly, shall reap also sparingly;" (γ) from the unmeaningness of diluting the command into a general one. The real reason of the obscurity of the precept arises from the delicacy with which the Apostle has stated it. The view which he took of it, as the simplest of all duties, sanctioned by the law and the Gospel alike, would remove any unwillingness to urge it, even in a communion which was so much alienated from him as the Galatians. Compare, as bearing upon this point, the use of the word χάρις in 1 Cor. xvi. 3., 2 Cor. viii. 4.; also Phil. iv. 17.

7. The Apostle adds a general

5 rejoicing in himself alone, and not in another. For
 6 every man shall bear his own burden. But let* him
 that is taught in the word communicate unto him that
 7 teacheth in all good things. Be not deceived; God is
 not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall
 8 he also reap. For he that soweth to his flesh shall of
 the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the
 9 Spirit shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting. But* let
 us not be weary in well doing: for in due season we
 10 shall reap, if we faint not. As we have therefore oppor-
 tunity, let us do good unto all men, especially unto
 them who are of the household of faith.

11 See* in what a large letter I have written unto you

warning. "Be not deceived, God is not mocked;" which seems also to have a partial reference to what has gone before. The willingness to support ministers was a test of the reality of religion. It was not like saying to our brother—"Be ye warmed, or be ye filled;" but was a substantial proof about which there could be no mistake. We may seek to deceive God, as Ananias and Sapphira did; but He cannot be deceived, and will reward every man according to his work.

In the image which follows, the readiness to give to others and assist their necessities, and not the whole Christian life in this world, is represented under the figure of the seed. We thus get a simpler explanation of ver. 8. and 10.

8. Compare Job, iv. 8. They that plough iniquity and sow wickedness, reap the same. Also, 2 Cor. ix. 6.

He who has his good things in this life, who spends his treasure

on earth, who sows to the flesh, shall of the flesh reap corruption.

Although it is true that *σάρξ* and *πνεῦμα* are opposed elsewhere, as Judaism and Christianity, yet the allusion appears too far-fetched for us to introduce it here. The Apostle is contrasting the life of self-indulgence which disregards the wants of others, with that spiritual life which is eternal.

9. *καρπῶ...ιδίῳ.*] In our harvest time. Compare Tit. i. 3., 1 Tim. iii. 15., 2 Thess. ii. 6.

μὴ ἐκλυόμενοι.] Not, "in due season we shall reap without fainting;" but, as in the English Version, "if we faint not." *μὴ ἐκλυόμενοι* is the repetition of *μὴ ἐγκακῶμεν* = *ἐγκακοῦντες*.

10. *ὡς καιρὸν ἔχοντες.*] The use of the word *καιρὸν* contains an allusion, rather of sound than sense, to *καρπῶ ιδίῳ* in the preceding verse. There is a time then, and a time now; a time in which we shall reap, and a time in which we shall sow.

ὅσοι θέλουσιν εὐπροσωπῆσαι ἐν σαρκί, οὗτοι ἀναγκάζου- 12
 σιν ὑμᾶς περιτέμεσθαι, μόνον ἵνα¹ τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ χριστοῦ
 μὴ διώκωνται· οὐδὲ γὰρ οἱ περιτετμημένοι² αὐτοὶ νόμον 13
 φυλάσσουσιν, ἀλλὰ θέλουσιν ὑμᾶς περιτέμεσθαι, ἵνα ἐν
 τῇ ὑμετέρᾳ σαρκὶ καυχῶσινται. ἐμοὶ δὲ μὴ γένοιτο καυ- 14
 χᾶσθαι, εἰ μὴ ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χρι-
 στοῦ, δι' οὗ ἐμοὶ κόσμος ἐσταύρωται καὶ γὰρ³ κόσμῳ· ἐν γὰρ 15

¹ Insert *μή* before *τῷ σταυρῷ*.² *περιτεμνόμενοι*.³ Add *τῷ*.

11. This curious verse has received several interpretations:—that of the English translation, “Ye see how large a letter I have written to you with my own hand;” to which it is truly objected that the Greek requires *πηλικά γράμματα ἔγραψα*. Chrysostom and other Fathers refer the expression to the ill-formed characters which St. Paul had written with his own hand, to attest the genuineness of the Epistle. Such an explanation appears not improbable, although that of Jerome is yet more likely, who takes the aorist for a present. “See you with what large letters I write with my own hand.” This explanation is put in its most probable point of view, if we suppose the remainder of the Epistle, which stands in no immediate connexion with what has preceded, but is a recapitulation of the whole, to be also written with the Apostle’s own hand. He has taken up the pen, and subjoins in a few emphatic sentences, the substance of what he had previously dictated.

12. *ὅσοι θέλουσιν*.] St. Paul here brings forward a new aspect of the party opposed to him; they were time-servers, not so much zealous for the law themselves, as desirous to keep on good terms

with those who were. It was a triumph to them to deliver their converts from the Apostle of the Gentiles.

εὐπροσωπῆσαι ἐν σαρκί *to make a fair shew in external*.] *οὗτοι* is not pleonastic, but emphatic, “these are the men who.”

μόνον ἵνα τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ χριστοῦ μὴ διώκωνται.] These words may be translated—“only that they may not be persecuted by the cross of Christ,” i. e. may not have fellowship with the sufferings of Christ. According to this explanation, however, there seems to be little force in the addition, “the cross of Christ,” as there can be no object in the Apostle exalting or magnifying their sufferings. It is better, therefore, to take the words according to a less common usage of the dative, found also in classical Greek, in the sense “because of the cross of Christ,” which, and not the mere name of Christ, St. Paul has already pointed out as the chief object of Jewish hostility. Comp. ver. 11.

13. The *γάρ* contains the proof of the preceding. And that they are mere time-servers, is evident from this, that the circumcised themselves do not keep the law; but they desire to have you circumcised, that they may glory in

12 with mine own hand. As many as desire to make a fair shew in the flesh, they constrain you to be circumcised; only lest they should suffer persecution for the cross of Christ. For neither they themselves who are circumcised keep the law; but desire to have you circumcised, that they may glory in your flesh. But God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world. For in Christ Jesus neither cir-

making you proselytes to Judaism.

In what way could St. Paul affirm that the Jewish teachers did not keep the law? Perhaps, like St. Peter, they were inconsistent, and while they retained some usages of the law, arbitrarily gave up others. This could hardly have been otherwise with Jews residing out of Palestine, or indeed with all everywhere. It may also be the case that the Apostle is referring to the new converts, who, however zealous for Judaism, were far from understanding either the law itself or the traditional interpretations of it, or he may allude to the impossibility of keeping the whole law.

14. ἐμοὶ δὲ μὴ γένοιτο καυχᾶσθαι.] "They desire to glory in Jewish ordinances, as men-pleasers and time-servers; I, in the cross of Christ, and in persecution and hostility of men." Two points of opposition between St. Paul and the false teachers are lightly touched:—(1.) Circumcision is contrasted with the cross of Christ. (2.) The time-serving of the one is contrasted with the sufferings of the other. *σάοξ* and *σταυρός* are the symbols

of Judaism and the Gospel, and both used also in their original as well as in their metaphorical meaning. Comp. a similar contrast in 1 Cor. iv. 9, 10.

δὲ οὖν] may be explained either "through Christ, or through the cross of Christ." Against the first it may be urged, that it is not Christ himself, but the death of Christ, that is naturally spoken of as the instrument whereby we become dead to the world. The second is preferable; *ἐσταύρωται* is a resumption of *σταυρός*.

κόσμος] = the world, whether Jewish or heathen, but chiefly the first. Compare above *στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου*. The reciprocity of the expression implies the completeness of the separation, as we might say—"He is nothing to me, and I am nothing to him."

What is meant by being crucified to the world? Not certainly being despised by the world, still less despising the world in return, nor any mere figure of speech; but whatever is meant by being dead or buried with Christ, by the old man being crucified, by the life hidden with Christ in God.

15. The text of the greater part of the Epistle has been—"If

χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ οὔτε περιτομή τι ἐστὶν¹ οὔτε ἀκροβυστία, ἀλλὰ καινὴ κτίσις. καὶ ὅσοι τῷ κανόνι τούτῳ στοιχήσου- 16
 σιν, εἰρήνη ἐπ' αὐτοὺς καὶ ἔλεος, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ τοῦ
 θεοῦ. τοῦ λοιποῦ κόπους μοι μηδεὶς παρεχέτω· ἐγὼ γὰρ 17
 τὰ στίγματα τοῦ² Ἰησοῦ ἐν τῷ σώματί μου βαστάζω.

Ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ μετὰ τοῦ 18
 πνεύματος ὑμῶν, ἀδελφοί, ἀμήν.³

¹ ισχύει.² Add κυρίου.³ Πρὸς Γαλάτας ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Ῥώμης.

ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing." But here, as at chap. v. ver. 6., the Apostle touches on a yet higher aspect of the subject. "Neither uncircumcision any more than circumcision, but a new creature."

16. ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ τοῦ Θεοῦ.] The difficulty of this verse is, how we are to distinguish the Israel of God from those who walk according to this rule. "Peace upon all those who serve the Lord Jesus Christ truly, and upon the Israel of God." The Apostle regards the same persons in two points of view, and with a certain inaccuracy divides them

into two:—The inaccuracy has perhaps arisen, and is partly concealed by the opposition between the Israel of God, and Israel according to the flesh. The only other way of meeting the difficulty is by referring "those who walk according to this rule" to the Gentiles, and "the Israel of God" to believing Jews. "Peace be upon the believing heathen to whom circumcision or uncircumcision is indifferent, and upon the Israelite indeed."

Compare, though not exactly parallel, 1 Cor. x. 32:—"Give none offence, neither to the Jews nor

- cumcision is ¹ any thing, nor uncircumcision, but a
 16 new creature. And as many as shall * walk according
 to this rule, peace be on them, and mercy, and upon the
 17 Israel of God. From henceforth let no man trouble me :
 for I bear in my body the marks of ² Jesus.
 18 Brethren, the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with
 your spirit. Amen.³

¹ Availeth.² Add the Lord.³ Unto the Galatians written from Rome.

to the Gentiles, nor to the Church of God ;"—also note on Rom. iv. 12.

17. τὰ στίγματα, *the marks*.] The feeling of this verse is anger passing into sorrow. The Apostle rightly thinks that the very persecutions which he endures, should give him a kind of sacredness in their eyes. The expression, "I bear in my body the marks of Jesus," is of the same kind as "I am crucified with Christ," Rom. vi. 6., Gal. ii. 20.; or "I fill up what is behind of the sufferings of Christ in my flesh,"

Col. i. 24. Having recently suffered persecution, he felt that this was a new link which bound him to his Lord. The marks which he saw in his flesh, reminded him of the wounds of Christ, perhaps suggesting also the thought that he was His branded slave. There have been those in later ages of the Church, who have by a self-imposed penance borne the marks of the Lord Jesus. They had not learnt the meaning of his own words. "It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing."

ST. PAUL AND THE TWELVE.

THE narrative of the second chapter of the Epistle to the Galatians suggests an inquiry, which lies at the foundation of all inquiries into the history of the early Church:—"In what relation did St. Paul stand to the Apostles at Jerusalem?" To which inquiry three answers may be given:—(1.) the answer which identifies the preaching of St. Paul and the Twelve; or, (2.) which opposes them; or, (3.) which, without absolutely either identifying or opposing them, allows for important differences arising from variety of external circumstances and of individual character. The first answer is that which would be gathered from the Acts of the Apostles, which presents only the picture of an unbroken unity; a view to which the Church in after ages naturally inclined, and which may be said to be caricatured in the explanation of Chrysostom and Jerome, that the dispute between the Apostles at Antioch was only a concerted fiction. Secondly, the answer which would be supplied by the Clementine homilies, in which St. Paul sustains the character of Simon Magus, and St. Peter is the Apostle of the Gentiles; such an answer as would probably have been given also in the writings (had they been preserved to us) of Marcion, by whom St. Paul in turn was magnified to the exclusion of the Twelve. The third answer is that which we believe would be drawn from a careful examination of the Epistles of St. Paul himself, the only contemporary documents:—"Separation not opposition, antagonism of the followers rather than of the leaders, personal antipathy of the Judaizers to St. Paul rather than of St. Paul to the Twelve."

The inquiry to which these three answers have been given, unavoidably runs up into the more general question of the relation

of the Gospel of the circumcision and the uncircumcision, and of the Jew to the Gentile. If in the second century these distinctions yet survived, if animosities against St. Paul were burning still, if a party without the Church ranged itself under his name, if later controversies have anything in common with that first difference of circumcision and uncircumcision, if in the earliest ecclesiastical history we find a silence respecting the person and an absence of the spirit of St. Paul, it is impossible to separate these facts from the record of the Apostle himself, that on a great occasion the other Apostles "added nothing to him;" and that at Antioch, which was more peculiarly his own sphere, he withstood Peter to the face. We recognise in the personal narrative of the Epistle to the Galatians, the germ of what reappears afterwards as the history of the Church. And had no record of either kind survived, had there been no hint anywhere dropped of divisions between St. Paul and the Twelve, no memorial extant of Judaizing heresies, we should feel that some account was still needed of the manner in which circumcision became uncircumcision, and the Jew was lost in the Gentile. Probably we might conjecture not in all places with equal readiness, nor equally after and before the destruction of Jerusalem or the revolt under Adrian, nor without imparting many elements of the law to the Gospel, nor, in accordance with the general laws of human nature, without some violence of party and opinion.

Events of the greatest importance in the history of mankind are not always seen to be important, until the time for preserving them is past. They have vanished into outline, and the details are filled up by the imagination or by the feelings of a later generation. This is especially the case with such events as stand in no relation to the public life of the time. Events of this kind, the most fruitful in results, may disappear themselves as though they had never been; they may also be magnified by present interests into false and exaggerated proportions. Who can tell what went on in a "large upper room" about the year 40? which may, nevertheless, have had vital consequences for the history of the world and the Church. Allusions in contemporary writings will be often insufficient to

retain the true meaning of institutions or events, or to dispel the errors that may distort or cover them. And the events which of all others are least likely to preserve their real aspect,—most subject to be forgotten on the one hand, or to be exaggerated on the other,—the most liable to be perverted, the least possible to read aright even in contemporary writings, are the differences of the first teachers of a religion, when they leave no permanent impress on its after-history.

These are the reasons why, on such a subject as the one we are considering, so much is left for speculation and for conjecture; why the result of so many books is so small; why there is so much criticism, and so little history. Not only are the materials slender, but the light by which they are seen is feeble; and hence the new combinations and constructions of them are necessarily uncertain. They cannot be left to lie flat upon the page of Scripture; least of all, can they be put together on the pattern of ecclesiastical tradition. Church history, like other history, may be made by the workings of the human mind to acquire a deceitful unity; it may gather to itself form and feature; it may convey a harmonious impression, which, from its mere internal consistency, it is difficult to resist. The philosophy of history readily weaves the tangle, developing the growth of ideas and connecting together causes and effects; but the unity which it creates is only artificial. Some other combination may be equally possible. Tradition, on the other hand, has a natural unity; but it is the unity of idea, which a later age gives to the past. It tells not what a former generation was, but what an after one thought it should have been. Many things came to light in the second century, which were unknown in the first. Still more in the third, that were unknown in the second. We turn from "this idol of the temple" to our earliest materials, the least hint in which, slender as they are, will be often of more value than all later traditions put together.

Many causes combine to produce a singular illusion in reference to the Church of the Apostolic age. There is the universal temptation to look back to a time when human nature was better than it is, when virtue and brotherly love were not an ideal

only, but had an actual habitation on the earth among men. The times of the Apostles are the golden age of the Church, in which, without spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing, it seems to come from the hands of its Divine Author—the New Jerusalem descending from heaven, arrayed in a portion of that glory with which the faith of the Apostles clothed it. Such is the idea which we instinctively form of the primitive Church, prior to any examination of the New Testament; an idea which is with difficulty laid aside in the face of the plainest facts. The misconception is further increased by the circumstance, that in modern times even more than in ancient, we have made the first century the battle-field of our controversies; instead of asking what was right, or true, or probable, what was the spirit or mind of Christ, we have constantly repeated the question, “What was the belief, constitution, practice, of the primitive Church?”—a question which we had, in reality, the smallest materials for answering, and which we had, therefore, the greatest temptation to answer according to our previous conception. The vacant space was in some way to be filled up. Could anything be more natural than that it should be filled up with the features of the third century? If we analyse closely what is the origin of many familiar conceptions respecting the Apostolic Church, we shall find that they consist of a sort of ideal, clothed in some of the externals of Tertullian or of Augustine, and conforming, as far as possible, to the use and practice of our own time.

The slightest knowledge of human nature is sufficient to assure us, that in the primitive Church there must have existed all the varieties of practice, belief, speculation, doctrine, which the different circumstances of the converts, and the different natures of men acting on those circumstances, would be likely to produce. The least examination of the Epistles is sufficient to show, not only what must have been, but what was. Even the Apostles and their immediate followers did not work together in the spirit of an order; but like men of strongly marked individual character, going by different roads to what did not always prove to be a common end. Not to anticipate the great division of which we are about to speak,

Paul, and Barnabas, and Apollos, and even Priscilla and Aquila, seem to have their separate spheres of labour and ways of acting; and a similar difference, though slightly marked, is observable in the relation of St. Peter to St. James. When the Apostles were withdrawn, the differences which had commenced during their life-time were not likely to disappear; in all that conflict of opinions, philosophies, religions, races, they must, for a time at least, have found food, and gathered strength.

Leaving such general speculations, we will now go back to the subject out of which they arose,—the difference of St. Paul and the Twelve, “the little cloud no bigger than a man’s hand,” the sign of that greater difference which spread itself over the face of the Church and the world.

The narrative of this difference is contained in the second chapter of the Epistle to the Galatians. The Apostle begins by asserting his Divine commission and independence of human authority, with an emphasis which implies that this could not have been acknowledged by the Judaizing Christians. After a few sharp words of remonstrance, he touches on such points in his personal history as tended to show that he had no connexion with the Twelve. It was not by their ministry that he was converted; and after his conversion, he had seen them only twice; once for so short a time that he was unknown by face to the Churches of Judea; on the latter of the two occasions, they had “added nothing to him” in a conference about circumcision. Afterwards, at Antioch, when Peter showed a disposition partially to retrace his steps, at the instigation of certain who came from James, he withstood him to the face, and rebuked his inconsistency, even though his helper, Barnabas, and all the other Jews were against him. The reason for narrating all this is to show, not how nearly the Apostle agreed with the Twelve, but how entirely he maintained his ground, meeting them on terms of freedom and equality.

There are features in this narrative which indicate a hostile, as there are other features which also indicate a friendly, bearing in the two parties who are here spoken of. Among the first may be classed the mention of false brethren, “who came in to spy out our liberty

in Christ Jesus." Were they Jews or Christians? and how came they to be present if the Apostles at Jerusalem could have prevented them? The number of them seems to indicate that there was no strong line of demarcation between the Jews and Christians at Jerusalem; and from the tone of the narrative we can hardly avoid drawing the conclusion, that the other Apostles scarcely resisted them, but left the battle to be fought by St. Paul. The second point which leads to the unfavourable inference is, the manner in which the Apostles of Jerusalem are spoken of—"those who seemed to be somewhat, whatsoever they were, it maketh no matter to me;" *οἱ δοκοῦντες εἶναι τι*, ver. 6., who are shown by the form of the sentence to be the same as *οἱ δοκοῦντες στύλοι εἶναι*, in ver. 9. Thirdly, the distinction of the Gospels of the circumcision and uncircumcision, which was not merely one of places, but in some degree of doctrine also. Fourthly, the use of the words (*ὑπόκρισις*) "hypocrisy," and (*κατεγνωσμένος*) "condemned," in reference to Peter's conduct; and, lastly, in ver. 12., the mention of certain who came from James, under whose influence the Apostle supposed Peter to have acted; which raises the suspicion of a regular opposition to St. Paul, acting in concert with the heads of the Church at Jerusalem. In the end, the other Apostles were determined by the fact, that a Church had grown up external to them, which was its own witness.

Yet in this very passage, there are also kindlier features, which restore us more nearly to our previous conception of the Apostolic Church. In the first place, there is no indication here, any more than elsewhere in the Epistles, of an open schism between St. Paul and the Twelve, which, had it existed, could not have failed to appear. Secondly, the differences are not of such a nature as to preclude the Church of Jerusalem from receiving, or the Apostle from giving, the alms of the Gentiles. Lastly, the expression, *οἱ δοκοῦντες εἶναι τι*, "who seemed to be somewhat," although ironical, is softened by what follows, *οἱ δοκοῦντες εἶναι στύλοι*, "who seemed to be pillars," in which the Apostle expresses the real greatness and high authority of the Twelve in their separate field of labour. Singular as the juxtaposition is of the false brethren, the Apostles "who added nothing to him," "the persons who came from James,"

the tone of the passage, as well as of every passage in which they are named, shows that on St. Paul's part there could have been no personal antagonism to the Twelve.

But not to anticipate the conclusion, we must here enter on a further stage of the same inquiry, the evidence supplied by the Epistles of St. Paul and other portions of the New Testament, on the subject which we are considering. Is it a mere passing incidental circumstance, happening for once in their lives, that the Apostles of Jerusalem and St. Paul met and had a partial difference? or is the difference alluded to, in a manner so unlike the violence of later controversy, merely an indication of a greater and more radical difference in the Church itself, faintly discernible in the persons of its leaders? We might be disposed to answer "yes" to the first alternative, were the first two chapters of the Galatians all that remained to us; we are compelled to say "yes" to the second, when we extend our view to other parts of Scripture.

Everywhere in the Epistles of St. Paul and in the Acts of the Apostles, we find traces of an opposition between the Jew and Gentile, the circumcision and the uncircumcision. It is found, not only in the Epistle to the Galatians, but in a scarcely less aggravated form, in the two Epistles to the Corinthians, softened, indeed, in the Epistle to the Romans, and yet distinctly traceable in the Epistle to the Philippians; the party of the circumcision appearing to triumph in Asia, at the very close of the Apostle's life, in the second Epistle to Timothy. In all these Epistles we have proofs of a reaction to Judaism, but, though they are addressed to Churches chiefly of Gentile origin, never of a reaction to heathenism. Could this have been the case, unless within the Church itself there had been a Jewish party urging upon the members of the Church the performance of a rite repulsive in itself, if not as necessary to salvation, at any rate as a counsel of perfection, seeking to make them in Jewish language, not merely proselytes of the gate, but proselytes of righteousness? What, if not this, is the reverse side of the Epistles of St. Paul? that is to say, the motives, object, or basis of teaching of his opponents, who came with "epistles of commendation" to the Church of Corinth, 2 Cor. iii. 1.; who profess themselves

"to be Christ's" in a special sense, 2 Cor. x. 7.; who say they are of Apollos, or Cephas, or Christ, 1 Cor. i. 12.; or James, Gal. ii. 12.; who preach Christ of contention, Phil. i. 15. 17.; who deny St. Paul's authority, 1 Cor. ix. 1., Gal. iv. 16.; who slander his life, 1 Cor. ix. 3. 7. We meet these persons at every turn. Are they the same, or different? Are they mere chance opponents? or do they represent to us one spirit, one mission, one determination to root out the Apostle and his doctrine from the Christian Church?

Nothing but the fragmentary character of St. Paul's writings would conceal from us the fact, that here was a concerted and continuous opposition. The same features recur, the same spirit breathes, the same accusations are repeated against the Apostle. Of going back to dumb idols there is never a word; it is not that sort of return which Paul fears, but the enforcement of circumcision, the observance of days and weeks, the loss of the freedom of the Gospel. It hardly needs to be proved, that St. Paul everywhere and at all times met with opposition; it is equally evident on the surface of the Epistles, that this opposition chiefly proceeded from Judaizing Christians. Still the question recurs, In what relation did its leaders stand to the Apostles at Jerusalem? Before attempting to answer this question finally, we must pause a moment to collect in one the evidence supplied by the Acts of the Apostles.

That from the beginning the elements of a division existed in the Christian Church is clear from the murmuring of the Grecians against the Hebrews, for the neglect of their widows in the daily ministration, which led to the appointment of the seven deacons. Indeed, they may be said to have pre-existed in the Jewish and Gentile world; many "schoolmasters" were bringing men to Christ, and the past history of man, then as now, seemed occasionally to re-awaken in the feelings of individuals. A first epoch in the history of the division is marked by the death of Stephen, which scattered a portion of the Church, whom the very circumstance of their persecution, as well as their dispersion in foreign countries, would tend to alienate from the observance of the Jewish law. A second epoch is distinguished by the preaching of St. Paul at Antioch; immediately after which we are informed that the disciples were first called

Christians. Then follows the Council, the more exact account of which is supplied by the Epistle to the Galatians, to which, however, one point is added in the narrative of the Acts,—the mention of certain who came from Jerusalem to Antioch, saying, “Except ye be circumcised, ye cannot be saved.” Passing onwards a little, we arrive at the address of St. Paul to the elders of the Church of Ephesus (Acts, xx. 29, 30.), which seems to allude to the same alienation from himself which had actually taken place in the second Epistle to Timothy (2 Tim. i. 15.). At length we come to St. Paul’s last journey to Jerusalem, and his interview with James, which was the occasion on which, by the advice of James, he took a vow upon him, in hope of calming the apprehensions of the multitude of “the many thousand Jews who believed and were all zealous for the law,” in which passage express reference is made to the decree of the Council. These leading facts are interspersed with slighter allusions, which must not be passed over as unimportant. Such are the words—“of the rest durst no man join himself to them,” indicating the way of life of the Apostles; “a great company of the priests were obedient unto the faith,” vi. 7.; “they that were scattered abroad upon the persecution of Stephen, preached the word to Jews only,” viii. 4.; the priority attributed to James in Acts, xii. 17.—“Go shew these things to James and the brethren;” the mention of the alms brought by Barnabas and Saul to Jerusalem in the days of Claudius Cæsar, xi. 29. Such in the latter half of the Acts (xxiii. 6.) is the declaration of St. Paul that he is a Pharisee. Nor is it without significance that in the discussion of this question of the admission of the Gentiles, no reference is made to the command of the Gospels, “Go and baptize all nations,” nor to the intercourse of Peter with Cornelius; and that no where are the other Apostles described as at variance with the Jewish Christians; nor in the whole later history of the Acts as suffering persecution from the Jews, or as taking any share in the persecution of St. Paul.

Now, with all the circumstances of the case before us, what shall we say in reply to the question from which we digressed? What was the relation of the Judaizing Christians to the Apostles at Jerusalem? Did those who remained behind in the Church regard the death of

the martyr Stephen with the same feelings as those who were scattered abroad? Were the Apostles at Jerusalem one in heart with the brethren at Antioch? Were the teachers who came from Jerusalem to Antioch saying, "Except ye be circumcised, ye cannot be saved," commissioned by the Twelve? Were the Twelve absolutely at one among themselves? Are the commendatory epistles spoken of in the Epistle to the Corinthians, to be ascribed to the Apostles at Jerusalem? Can "the grievous wolves," whose entrance into the Church of Ephesus the Apostle foresaw, be other than the Judaizing teachers? Lastly, Were the multitude of believing Jews, zealous for the law, and quickened in their zeal for it by the very sight of St. Paul, engaged in the tumult which follows? These are different ways of stating the same question, or subordinate questions connected with it, which of themselves assist in supplying an answer.

If we conceive of the Apostles as exercising a strict and definite authority over the multitude of their converts, living heads of the Church as they might be termed, Peter or James of the circumcision and Paul of the uncircumcision, it would be hard to avoid connecting them with the acts of their followers. One would think that, in accordance with the spirit of the concordat, they should have "delivered over to Satan" the opponents of St. Paul, rather than have lived in communion and company with them. To hold out the right hand of fellowship to Paul and Barnabas, and yet secretly to support or not to discountenance those who opposed them, would be little short of treachery to their common Master, especially when we observe how strongly the Judaizers are characterised by St. Paul as the false brethren who came in unawares, the false Apostles transforming themselves into Apostles of Christ, "grievous wolves entering in," &c. Nothing can be more striking than the contrast between the vehemence with which St. Paul treats his Judaizing antagonists, and the gentleness or silence which he never fails to preserve towards the Apostles at Jerusalem.

Yet it may be questioned whether the whole difficulty does not arise from a false conception of the authority of the Apostles in the early Church. Although the first teachers of the word of Christ, they were not the acknowledged rulers of the Catholic Church; they

were its prophets, not its bishops. The influence which they exercised, was personal rather than official, derived doubtless from their having seen the Lord, and the fact of their appointment by Himself, yet confined also to a comparatively narrow sphere ; it was exercised in places in which they were, but hardly extended to places where they were not. The Gospel grew up around them they could not tell how ; and the spirit which their preaching awakened soon passed out of their control. They seemed no longer to be the prime movers, but rather the spectators of the work of God which went on before their eyes. The thousands of Jews that believed and were zealous for the law, would not lay aside the garb of Judaism at the bidding of James or Peter ; the false teachers of Corinth or of Ephesus would not have been less likely to gain followers, had they been excommunicated by them. The movement which, in twenty years from the death of Christ, had spread so widely over the earth, they no more sought to reduce to rule and compass. It was out of their power, beyond their reach, extending to Churches which had no connexion with themselves, of the circumstances of which they were hardly informed, and in which, therefore, it was not natural that they should interfere between St. Paul and his opponents.

The moment we think of the Church, not as an ecclesiastical or political institution, but as it was in the first age, a spiritual body, that is to say, a body partly moved by the Spirit of God, but dependent also on the tempers and sympathies of men, and swayed to and fro by religious emotion, the narrative of Scripture seems perfectly truthful and natural. When the waves are high, we see but a little way over the ocean ; the very intensity of religious feeling is inconsistent with a uniform level of Church government. It is not a regular hierarchy, but "some apostles, some prophets, some evangelists, others pastors and teachers," who grew together "into the body of Christ." The image of the earlier Church that is every where presented to us in the Epistles, implies great freedom of individual action. Apollos and Barnabas were not under the guidance of Paul ; those "who were distinguished among the Apostles before him," could hardly have owned his authority. Nor is any attempt

made to bring the different Churches under a common system. We cannot imagine any bond by which they could have been linked together, without an order of clergy or form of Church government common to them all: and of this there is no trace in the Epistles of St. Paul. It was hard to keep the Church at Corinth at unity with itself; how much harder to have brought other Churches into union with it?

Of this fluctuating state of the Church, which was not yet addicted to any one rule, we find an indication of a different kind, in the freedom, almost levity, with which professing Christians embraced "traditions of men." Nothing was less like the attitude of the Church of Corinth towards the Apostle, than the implicit belief in a faith "once delivered to the saints." We know not whether Apollos was or was not a teacher of Alexandrian learning among its members, or what was the exact nature of "the party of Christ," 1 Cor. i. 12. That heathen as well as Jewish elements had found their way into the Church is indicated by the false "wisdom," the denial of the resurrection, and the resort to the idol's temple. In the Church at Colossæ, again, something was suspected by the Apostle which is dimly seen by us, and seems to have held an intermediate position between Judaism and heathenism; or rather, to have partaken of the nature of both. It was wisdom the Greek sought after, the want of which in the Gospel was his great stumbling-block, which he was most likely, therefore, to intrude upon its teaching. The tendency of the Jew was at once to humanise and mysticise it; he could never have enough of wonders (1 Cor. i. 22.), yet was unable to understand its true wonder, "the cross of Christ."

Amid such fluctuation and variety of opinions we can imagine Paul and Apollos, or Paul and Peter, preaching side by side in the Church of Corinth or of Antioch, like Wesley and Whitfield in the last century, or Luther and Calvin at the Reformation, with a sincere reverence for each other, not abstaining from commenting on or condemning each other's doctrine or practice, and yet also forgetting their differences in their common zeal to save the souls of men. Personal regard is quite consistent with differences of religious belief; some of which, with good men, are a kind of form, belonging

only to their outer nature, most of which, as we hope, exist only on this side the grave. We can imagine the followers of such men as we have been describing incapable of acting in their noble spirit, with a feebler sense of their high calling, and a stronger one of their points of disagreement; losing the great principle for which they were alike contending in "oppositions of knowledge," in prejudice and personality. And lastly, we may conceive the disciples of Wesley or of Whitfield (for of the Apostles themselves we forbear to move the question), reacting upon their masters and drawing them into the vicious circle of controversy, disuniting them in their lives, though at the last hour incapable of making a separation between them.

Of such a nature we believe the differences to have been which separated St. Paul and the Twelve, arising in some degree from differences of individual character, but much more from their followers and the circumstances of their lives. They were differences which seldom brought them into contact, and once or twice only into collision; they did not with logical exactness divide the world. It may have been, "I unto the heathen, and they unto the circumcision;" and yet St. Paul may have felt a deep respect for those "that seemed to be pillars," and they may have acknowledged thankfully the success of his labours. It is not even necessary to suppose that the agreement of the Council, the terms of which are differently described in Galatians ii. and Acts xv., was minutely observed for a long period of years. The freedom which made it possible that the differences between Jew and Gentile should co-exist, made it impossible that the Twelve should always be able to control their followers, and unlikely that they themselves should wholly abstain from showing their sympathy towards those who seemed to be joined to them by the ties of nationality. A party in the Church of Corinth sought to call itself by their name, in opposition to that of St. Paul: it was they, probably, who gave "the epistles of commendation" to those who taught at Corinth; they, or at least one of their number, sent messengers from Jerusalem to Antioch, at a critical moment in the dispute about circumcision.

Admitting even the darkest colour that can be put upon these latter facts, still the absence of all hostile allusion to the Twelve in

the writings of St. Paul, the circumstance of the Jerusalem Church being supported by the contributions of the Gentiles, the other circumstance of teachers of the circumcision being among the companions of St. Paul in his imprisonment (Col. iv. 10, 11.); the appeal to the witness and example of the other Apostles (1 Cor. xv. v.; ix. 5-), are sufficient to justify the view which we took at the outset of the relation of St. Paul to the Twelve: "Separation, not opposition, antagonism of the followers rather than of the leaders, personal antipathy of the Judaizers to St. Paul, more than of St. Paul to the Judaizers." Many things must have been done by the fanaticism of professing adherents, of which it was impossible for the Twelve to approve,—which, when separated by distance, it was equally impossible for them to repress. Even at Jerusalem, under the eye of the Apostles, though it may be uncertain whether "the multitude zealous for the law" were the same or partly the same with that which was engaged in the tumult against St. Paul, it is plain that James speaks of them as incapable of being swayed by his authority. It was the impossibility of exercising this authority that justified the Twelve, and made it possible, in spite of their adherents, that they should remain in the love of their common Lord towards St. Paul.

Regarding then the whole number of believers in Judea, in Greece, in Italy, in Egypt, in Asia, as a sort of fluctuating mass, of whom there were not many wise, not many learned, not all governed by the maxims of common prudence, needing many times to have the way of God expounded to them more perfectly, and, from their imperfect knowledge, arrayed against one another, subject to spiritual impulses, and often mingling with the truth Jewish and sometimes heathen notions; we seem to see the Twelve placed on an eminence above them, and, as it were, apart from them, acting upon them rather than governing them, retired from the scene of St. Paul's labours, and therefore hardly coming into conflict with him, either by word or by letter. They led a life such as St. James is described as leading by Hegesippus, "going up into the temple at the hour of prayer," revered by a multitude of followers zealous for the law, themselves, like Peter, half conscious of a higher truth, and yet by their very position debarred from being its ministers. Though bearing the

common name of Christ, it was not by accident, but by agreement that they were led to labour in different spheres. The world, as we might say, was wide enough for them both. The Apostle St. Paul's rule is not to intrude upon another man's labours, but he does not aim at confining any province or district to himself or to his followers. He makes no claim to be the visible head of any section of the Church, but only the servant of Christ. Even the hold he retains over his own converts is precarious and uncertain. The idea of a Catholic Church one and indivisible throughout the earth, had not as yet come into existence, though the way for it was preparing, and the elements out of which it arose were already working.

The inquiry into the relation in which St. Paul stood to the Twelve runs up into a further question respecting the Gospel which they preached. "What was that different form or aspect of Christian truth which was called the Gospel of the circumcision, as compared with that of the uncircumcision?" Was it a difference of doctrine or of practice, of belief or of Spirit? Viewed as a matter of doctrine we are almost surprised to find into how small a compass the difference reduces itself. So St. Paul himself seems to have felt, even amid his strongest denunciations of the Judaizing teachers. All were baptized in the name of Christ, with whom the Twelve had walked while He was upon earth; whom St. Paul, equally with them, had seen with the spiritual eye, as "one born out of due time." It was the same Christ whom they preached (there was no dispute about this), though the manner of preaching may have differed with difference of natural character or education, or the different manner of His revelation to them. "Other foundation could no man lay," as the Apostle says to the Church at Corinth, though he might build many superstructures. It was not "another Gospel," as he indignantly declares to the Church in Galatia, for there was not, and could not be another. Or, according to another manner of speaking (2 Cor. xi. 4.), it was still Jesus, though another Jesus; and the Spirit, though another Spirit. In the Church of Rome, as the Apostle writes to the Philippians, there were those who preached Christ of contention, in which the Apostle nevertheless rejoiced, as an honour to the name of Christ. That in the Judaizing teachers,

as well as the Apostles themselves, St. Paul saw at any time true though mistaken preachers of the Word, is a fact of great significance in reference to our present purpose. The cross of Christ was peculiarly the symbol of St. Paul, yet all probably, or almost all, looked with common feelings of affection to Him who died for them.

But not only did St. Paul and the Twelve regard the name of Christ with the same feelings (a statement which might be made almost equally of nearly all the earliest heretical sects), but they agreed also in considering the Old Testament, rightly understood, as the source of the New. The mystery of past ages was latent there. Through so many centuries it had been misunderstood or unknown : it had now come to light. The same God who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in times past to the Fathers by the Prophets, had in these last days spoken to men by His Son. There was no opposition between the Old Testament and the New ; it was the law, with its burden on the conscience, and its questions respecting meats and drinks, and new moons and sabbaths, which contrasted with the Gospel.

Once more : besides the name of Christ and the connexion of the Old and New Testament, another point common to St. Paul and the Twelve was their expectation of the day of the Lord. Nowhere does the Apostle appear so much "a Hebrew of the Hebrews," as in speaking of the invisible world. He opposes this world and the next, as the times before and after the coming of the Messiah were divided by the Jews themselves ; he sees them peopled with a celestial hierarchy of good and evil angels. He is waiting for the revelation of Antichrist and the manifestation of the Sons of God. The same signs follow the reception of the Gospel in the Churches founded by the Twelve and by St. Paul ; "the Holy Ghost fell upon them as upon us at the beginning," might have been the description of the Church of Corinth, no less than of the Church at Jerusalem. And, as St. Paul says, in the Epistle to the Romans, in reference to the admission of the Gentiles, God is no respecter of persons, Peter commences his address to Cornelius with the words, "Of a truth I perceive God is no respecter of persons."

Even setting aside the last passage, as hard to reconcile with the subsequent conduct of Peter, still, enough remains to show that the Gospel preached by St. Paul and the Twelve was in substance the same. To preach to the Gentiles, it must be remembered, was a command of Christ himself. If, with the exception of the Epistle of St. James, we have no epistles extant which bear the impress of Jewish Christianity, still we can hardly doubt that the three first Gospels represent in the main the model on which was based the teaching of the Twelve ; that is to say, the difference between St. Paul's Epistles and the Gospel of St. Matthew is a fair measure of the utmost limits of the distance which separated the Apostle of the Gentiles from the Apostles of the circumcision.

Admitting such points of agreement, the differences lie within narrow limits ; they could not have originated in anything that we should consider fundamental articles of the Christian faith. They may have arisen out of a sympathy for or antipathy towards the Alexandrian learning. The mere difference of language may have made the same kind of difference between the Church at Jerusalem and those founded by St. Paul, as divides the Old Testament from the later Apocryphal Books. Much also, humanly speaking, may have arisen from the difference in their way of life. Those who went up to the Temple at the hour of prayer, who lived amid the smoke of the daily sacrifices, could hardly have felt, and thought, and spoken as the Apostle of the Gentiles, wandering through Greece and Asia, from city to city, in barbarous as well as civilised countries ; they at least could not have been expected to say, "Let no man judge you of a New Moon or a Sabbath day." Like our Lord remaining within the confines of Judea, there were many truths which they were not called upon to utter in the same emphatic way as St. Paul.

Such are a few conjectures respecting the nature of the difference which separated St. Paul from the Twelve. The point that is independent of conjecture is that it related to the obligation on the Gentiles to keep the Mosaic Law. It is characteristic of the earliest times of the Church, that the dispute referred rather to a matter of practice than of doctrine. Long ere the Gospel was drawn out in a system of doctrine, the difference between Judaism and Christianity

was instinctively felt. There were times and places in which, even in the mind of the Christian, Jewish prejudices seemed too strong for the freedom wherewith Christ had made him free. There was no difficulty in allowing that all nations were to be baptized in the name of Christ, and that there was to be one fold and one Shepherd. This had been determined by an authority from which there could be no appeal. The difficulty was to go in "to men uncircumcised, and eat with them," amid the derision or persecution of Jews, or Jewish Christians. Our Lord had decided that Gentiles were to be admitted to the Church; but on what conditions they were to be so admitted was left to be inferred from the spirit of His teaching. There was no putting an end to the controversy; and the timidity of St. Peter, and the conciliatory temper of St. Paul, indicate a disposition to maintain these scruples, or an unwillingness to disturb them.

The adoption of a theory, which, however innocently, we fail to carry out in practice, almost necessarily involves inconsistency. Suppose a person maintaining liberty of conscience, yet refusing to avail himself of that liberty, or to act as though he maintained it, is it not nearly certain that when surrounded by particular influences he would cease to maintain it? Few, comparatively, have sufficient strength of character to carry a single speculative principle through life. Experience shows us that inconsistency, so far from being rare, is the commonest of all failings. Narrowness of intellect, and feebleness of perception, are quite as common causes of it as weakness of character. The mind, under the pressure of new circumstances, and in a strange place, ceases to perceive that old principles are still applicable. Its sympathies draw it one way, its sense of right another. The habits of youth, or the instincts of childhood, re-assert themselves in mature life. He who is the first, and even the ablest to speak, may be often deficient in firmness of will or grasp of mind. Such reflections on human nature are sufficient to explain the conduct of Peter, and they are confirmed by what we know of him.

Adding to our former indications of the relations in which the Apostle of the Gentiles stood to the Twelve such further evidences as we are able to glean from the teaching and character of St. Peter

and St. Paul, we have to carry our inquiry into a third stage, as it re-appears once more in what may be termed the twilight of Ecclesiastical history — that century after the Neronian persecution, of which we know so little, and desire to know so much; the aching void of which we are tempted to fill up with the image of the century which succeeds it. To collect together all the scattered rays which might illustrate our subject, would carry us too far into the general history of the Church, and lead to discussions respecting the genuineness of Patristic writings, and the truth of events narrated in them. The “romance of heresy” would be the mist of fiction, through which we should endeavour to penetrate to the light. The origin of Episcopal government, which seems to stand in a sort of antagonism to heresy, would be one of the elements of our uncertainty. We should have to begin by forming a criterion of the credibility of Irenæus, Clement, Tertullian, Origen, and Eusebius. But a subject so wide is matter not for an essay but for a book; it is the history of the Church of the first two centuries. We must therefore narrow our field of vision as much as possible, and confine ourselves to the consideration of this third stage of our subject, so far as it throws a remote light back on the differences of the Apostles, drawing conclusions only which rest on facts that are generally admitted.

Two general facts meet us at the outset, which it is necessary to bear in mind in the attempt to balance the more particular statements that follow. First, the utter ignorance of the third century respecting the first, and earlier half of the second. We cannot err in supposing that those who could add nothing to what is recorded in the New Testament of the life of Christ and His Apostles, had no real knowledge of lesser matters, as, for example, the origin of Episcopacy. They could not appreciate; they had no means of preserving the memory of a state of the Church which was unlike their own. Irenæus, who lived within a century of St. Paul, has not added a single circumstance to what we gather from the New Testament. Eusebius, with the writings of Papias and Hegesippus, and all ecclesiastical antiquity before him, has preserved nothing which relates to the difference of St. Paul and the Twelve, or

which throws the smallest light on any other difficulty in the New Testament. The image of the primitive Church, which they seemed to see, when it was not mere vacancy, was the image of themselves.

The second general fact is the unconsciousness of this ignorance, and the readiness with which the vacant space is filled up, and the Church of the second century assimilated to that of the third and fourth. Human nature tends to conceal that which is discordant to its preconceived notions; silently dropping some facts, exaggerating others, adding, where needed, new tone and colouring until the disguise of history can no longer be detected. By some such process has the circumstance we are inquiring into been forgotten and reproduced. Not only what may be termed the "animus" of concealment is traceable in the strange account of the dispute between the Apostles, given by Jerome and Chrysostom, but in earlier writings, in which the two Apostles appear side by side as cofounders, not only of the Roman, but also of the Corinthian Church; as pleading their cause together before Tiberius; dying on the same day; buried, according to some, in the same grave. The motive, or, more strictly speaking, the unconscious instinct, which gave birth to this acknowledged fiction was, probably, the desire to throw a veil over that occasion on which they withstood one another to the face. And the truth indistinctly shines through this legend of the latter part of the second century, when it is further recorded that St. Paul was the head of the Gentile Church, Peter of the circumcision.

Bearing in mind these two general facts, the tendency of which is to throw a degree of doubt on the early ecclesiastical tradition, and so to lead us to seek for indications out of the regular course of history, we have to consider, in reference to our present subject, the following statements:—

1. That Justin, and probably Hegesippus and Papias, living at a time when the Epistles of St. Paul must have been widely spread, were unacquainted with them or their author.

2. That Marcion, who was their contemporary, appealed exclusively to the authority of St. Paul in opposition to the Twelve.

3. That in the account of James the Just, given by Josephus and

Hegesippus, he is represented as a Jew among Jews ; living, according to Hegesippus, the life of a Nazarite ; praying in the Temple until his knees became hard as a camel's, and so entirely a Jew as to be unknown to the people for a Christian ; a picture which, though its features may be exaggerated, yet has the trace of a true resemblance to the part which we find him acting in the Epistle to the Galatians.

4. That in the Clementine Homilies, A. 160, though a work otherwise orthodox, St. Paul is covertly introduced under the name of Simon Magus, as the enemy who had pretended visions and revelations, and who withstood and blamed Peter. No writer doubts the allusion in these passages to the Epistle to the Galatians. Assuming their connexion, we cannot but ask, as bearing on our present inquiry, What was the state of mind which could have led an orthodox Christian, who lived probably at Rome, about the middle of the second century, to affix such a character to St. Paul? and what was the motive which induced him to veil his meaning? What, too, could have been the state of the Church in which such a romance could have grown up? and how could the next generation have read it without perceiving its true aim? Doubtful as may be the precise answer to these questions, we cannot attribute this remarkable work to the wayward fancy of an individual ; it is an indication of a real tendency of the first and second century, at a time when the flame was almost extinguished, but still slumbered in the mind of the writer of the Clementine Homilies.

5. Lastly, that in later writings we find no trace of the mind of St. Paul. His influence, for a season, seems to vanish from the world. On such a basis "as where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty," it might have been impossible to rear the fabric of a hierarchy. But the tide of ecclesiastical feeling set in an opposite direction. It was not merely that after-writers fell short of St. Paul, or imperfectly interpreted him, but that they formed themselves on a different model. It was not merely that the external constitution of the Church had received a definite form and shape, but that the inward perception of the nature of the Gospel was different. No writer of the latter half of the second century would have spoken as St. Paul

has done of the law, of the sabbath, of justification by faith only, of the Spirit, of grace. An echo of a part of his teaching is heard in Augustine; with this exception, the voice of him who withstood Peter to the face at Antioch, was silent in the Church until the Reformation.

Gathering around us, then, once more the grounds on which our judgment must be formed from the Epistles of St. Paul, the Acts of the Apostles, and the earliest ecclesiastical tradition, we arrive once more at the thrice-repeated conclusion, that the relation of St. Paul and the Twelve was separation, not opposition; antagonism of the followers, rather than of the leaders; enmity of the Judaizers to St. Paul, not of St. Paul to the Judaizers. Naturally the principle of the Apostle was triumphant; commencing like the struggle of Athanasius against the world, it ended as the struggle of the world must end against the half extinct remnant of the Jewish race. But the good fight which the Apostle fought, was not immediately crowned by the final victory. In the dawn of ecclesiastical history, as the Twelve were one by one withdrawn from the scene, the battle was still going on, dimly seen by us within and without the Church; its last shadows seeming to retire from view in the Easter controversy of the second century. Two events especially exercised a great influence on it. First, the destruction of Jerusalem, and the flight to Pella of the Christian community; secondly, the revolt under Barchocab; both tending to separate, more and more, both in fact and the opinion of mankind, the Christian from the Jew. At length, the succession of Jewish Christian episcopacy ceased; the first Bishop of Ælia Capitolina being a Gentile.

That that intermediate century of which we know so little, was not a period in which the Church had reason to glory, is witnessed to by the very absence of memorials respecting it. There was a want of great teachers after the Apostles were withdrawn; then, according to the idea of a later generation, when there were no more living heads, heresy sprang up. There was something in that century which those who followed it were either unwilling to recall, or unable to comprehend. The Church was in process of organisation, fencing itself with creeds and liturgies, taking possession of the earth

with its hierarchy. The principle of St. Paul triumphs, and yet it seems to have lost the spirit and power of St. Paul. There is no more question of Jew and Gentile; but neither is there any trace of the freedom of the Apostle. The lesson which that age silently learned, was that of ecclesiastical order and government. It built up the body of Christ from without, as St. Paul had built it up from within. And there would have been the same inconsistency in supposing that the doctrine of the Apostle could have been fully received in the second century, as in supposing that he himself would have preached it in Palestine in the first.

It would be vain to carry our inquiry further, with a view to glean a few doubtful results respecting the first half of the second century. Remote probabilities and isolated facts are hardly worth balancing. By some course of events with which we are imperfectly acquainted, the Providence of God leading the way, and the thoughts of man following, the Jewish Passover became the Christian Easter; the Jewish sabbath, the Christian Sunday; Circumcision passed into uncircumcision; the law was done away in Christ, while the Old Testament retained its authority over Gentile as well as Jewish Christians; and the party which would have excommunicated St. Paul, before the end of the second century had itself left the Church. The relation of St. Paul to the Twelve may be regarded as the type and symbol, and, in some degree, the cause of that final adjustment of the differences between Jew and Gentile, without which it would not have been possible, humanly speaking, that the Gospel could have become an universal religion.

PALEY ON THE GALATIANS.

THE most sceptical criticism has left untouched the Epistle to the Galatians. No one has ever imagined that it was based on the narrative of the Acts; no one has doubted that it was a writing of St. Paul. We may, therefore, cease to raise up defences of its genuineness; the very attempt to do so being liable to cast suspicion on what would otherwise be undoubted.

For this reason it is unnecessary to follow Paley through the proof which he offers, in No. 1., of the exact adaptation of the Epistle to the time and circumstances at which it may be supposed to have been written; or, in No. 2., that the Acts and the Epistle are independent of, and yet in numerous particulars confirm, each other; or, in No. 3., that the particularity and number of the points of connexion between them, prove that the Epistle could have been written by none other than the Apostle himself; or, in No. 4., that the indirect allusion to his infirmity in iv. 11—16. is too subtle a coincidence with 2 Cor. xii. 1—9., to be within the range of a forger's ingenuity; or, in No. 5., that the figure of chap. iv. 29., which implies that the Apostle was persecuted by them "that were born after the flesh," is curiously, and apparently incidently, confirmed by the ever recurring persecutions of Jews in the Acts; or, in No. 6., that the spirit of Gal. vi. 1., "Brethren, if a man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spiritual restore such an one in the spirit of meekness," singularly agrees with the actual conduct of the Apostle, in his second admonition about the incestuous person, in 2 Cor. ii. 6—8.; or, in No. 7., that the disavowal of the obligation of the Jewish law, either on Jews or Gentiles, in the Galatians, similarly agrees with his acknowledged occasional conformity to it for a particular purpose. All these points of agreement are far from having equal force, though

all have some force ; the last being, perhaps, the least satisfactory ; as, although the Acts of the Apostles no where assert that St. Paul insisted on the observance by Gentiles of the Jewish law, but quite the reverse ; yet they no where distinctly imply that he maintained the abolition of the law as binding on the conscience for Jews as well as Gentiles.

In many of the remarks by which Paley seeks to confirm his forcible and ingenious arguments, it is not possible, however, to agree. Here, as in the Epistle to the Thessalonians, he shows the tact of an advocate, not the impartiality of a judge. This is especially exhibited in the manner in which he marshals his arguments. There are points in which the history of the Acts confirms the narrative of the Epistle, and in which the Epistle bears incidental testimony to the truth of the history, as there are points also of discrepancy between them. But to use the latter as a proof of the independence of the two narratives, and the former as an evidence of their truth and accuracy, is not an equitable method of proceeding, unless we balance the one with the other, and acknowledge the joint result. Two things which are in reality inseparable, have been separated by Paley ; and the artificial division adds an apparent force to his argument. This apparent force is further increased by the circumstance that the more important differences he either omits to notice, or puts them in such a light as tends to conceal them from the reader's eye.

No. 8., in which Paley argues from the allusion in Acts, xxii. 18., "Make haste, and get thee quickly out of Jerusalem: for they will not receive thy testimony concerning me," to the agreement between the statement of the Galatians, chap. i. 18., that St. Paul abode at Jerusalem, on his first visit, fifteen days only, and the apparently longer stay, implied in the ninth chapter of the Acts, when he is described as "coming in and going out with them at Jerusalem, and speaking boldly in the name of Jesus," is one instance of the want of fairness alluded to. For, in the first place, there is nothing in the twenty-second chapter of the Acts to indicate that the message, "get thee quickly out," was given immediately after the Apostle's entry into Jerusalem ; in the second place, a discrepancy remains behind, which Paley has omitted to notice. For in the ninth chapter of the

Acts, the Apostle is represented as coming in and going out at Jerusalem with the disciples; and at last driven forth by an attempt of the Greeks to slay him; whereas, in Acts, xxii. 18—21., the reason of the unwillingness to receive him is said to be his former persecution of the Church. The last passage, if taken in its natural sense, is perfectly consistent with the Epistle to the Galatians, but cannot be construed into a means of reconciliation between Acts, ix. and Gal. ii., if any reconciliation of them is necessary, as Paley seems to suppose, while he omits the greater difference.

Nor, again, in No. 10., is it quite satisfactory to omit to notice the different character in which James is exhibited in the Acts, as the supporter of St. Paul on two great occasions of dispute (Acts, xv. 13.; xxi. 18.) between Jew and Gentile, compared with the light in which he is incidentally alluded to in Gal. ii. 12. (comp. ver. 9.), or the inconsistency in Peter's conduct at Antioch, when compared not merely with the decree of the council which is alluded to by Paley, but with the vision at Joppa, which is omitted by him, though more to the point.

But the greatest instance, not of unfairness in the writer, but of want of perception of what is due to the reader, occurs in the comparison of the visit of Gal. ii. with the council in Acts, xv. The true result of such a comparison is to show the identity of the two occasions (see note at the end of chap. ii.), amid the diversity of the accounts of them. Paley, while half admitting this identity, overlooks the extreme difficulty of supposing that St. Paul should have referred to this visit and yet have concealed precisely that circumstance in it which was most to the purpose.

No critic can doubt the genuineness of the Epistle to the Galatians, though not always for the reasons which are alleged by Paley. It is not a mere flourish of theological rhetoric to ask, "Who could have acted that passionate emotion which brings to light so many traits of character both in the Apostle and in the Church, which is interwoven by so many threads with the Apostolical age, which is most natural if real, and all but inconceivable if due to the imagination of a forger?" The single passage, Gal. ii. 1—14., so plain in its statement, so unlike the later history of the Church or the ideal

which we sometimes form of the times of the Apostles, closely as it is connected with the rest of the Epistle, is of itself sufficient to establish the genuineness of the whole.

The narrative of the Acts of the Apostles, when compared with the Epistle to the Galatians, does not show equal historical accuracy. It differs in details, and also in the point of view in which its author regards the question of Jew and Gentile. Was it that years had passed away, and the breaches between the Apostles were no longer seen in the distance, or forgotten in their common sufferings? Whatever may have been the reason, the amount of discrepancy between the earlier chapters of the Acts and the Epistle to the Galatians affords a striking contrast with the precise agreement of the later chapters with the Romans and Corinthians.

In inquiries of this sort it is often supposed that, if the evidence of the genuineness of a single book of Scripture be weakened, or the credit of a single chapter shaken, a deep and irreparable injury is inflicted on Christian truth. It may afford a rest to the mind to consider that, if but one discourse of Christ, one Epistle of Paul, had come down to us, still more than half would have been preserved. Coleridge has remarked that out of a single play of Shakespeare the whole of English literature might be restored. Much more true is it that, in short portions or single verses of Scripture the whole spirit of Christianity is contained.

ON THE QUOTATIONS FROM THE OLD TESTAMENT IN THE NEW.

THE New Testament is ever old, and the Old is ever entwined with the New. Not only are the types of the Old Testament shadows of good things to come; not only are the narratives of events and lives of persons in Jewish history "written for our instruction;" not only is there a deep-rooted identity of the Old and New Testament in the revelation of one God of perfect justice and truth; not only is "the law fulfilled in Christ to all them that believe;" not only are the spiritual Israel the true people of God; a still nearer, though more superficial connexion is formed by the volume of the Old Testament itself, which, like some closely-fitting vesture, enfolds the new as well as the old dispensation in its language and imagery, the words themselves, as well as the thoughts contained in them, becoming instinct with a new life, and seeming to interpenetrate with the Gospel.

This verbal connexion of new and old is not peculiar to Christianity. All nations who have ancient writings have endeavoured to read in them the riddle of the past. The Brahmin, repeating his Vedic hymns sees them pervaded by a thousand meanings, which have been handed down by tradition: the one of which he is ignorant is that which we perceive to be the true one. Without more reason, and almost with an equal disregard or neglect of its natural import, the Jewish Alexandrian and Rabbinical writers analysed the Old Testament; in a similar spirit Gnostics and Neoplatonists cited lines of Homer or Pindar. Not unlike is the way in which the Fathers cite both the Old and New Testament; and the manner in which the writers of the New Testament quote from the Old has more in common with this last than with modern critical interpretations of either. That is to say, the quotations are made almost always with-

out reference to the connexion in which they originally occur, and in a different sense from that in which the prophet or psalmist intended them. They are fragments culled out and brought into some new combination; jewels, and precious stones, and corner-stones disposed after a new pattern, to be the ornaments of another temple. It is their place in that new temple, not their relation to the old, which gives them their effect and meaning.

Such "tesselated work" was after the manner of the age: it was no new invention or introduction of the sacred writers. Closely as it is wrought into the New Testament, it belongs to its externals rather than to its true life. There are few, if any, traces of it in the discourses of our Lord Himself, though it frequently recurs in the comments of the Evangelists. The fact that all religions which are possessed of sacred books, and many even without them, have passed through a like secondary stage, however different may have been their relation to the earlier forms of the same religions from that in which the Gospel stands to the Old Testament, leads us to regard this verbal connexion as a phenomenon of the mind which may receive light from heathen parallels. There seem to be times in which human nature yearns toward the past, though it has lost the power of interpreting it. Overlooking the chasm of a thousand years, it seeks to extract from ancient writings food for daily life. The mystery of a former world lies heavy upon it, hardly less than of the future, and it lightens this burden by attributing to "them of old time" the thoughts and feelings of contemporaries. It feels the unity of God and man in all ages, and it attempts to prove this unity by reading the same thoughts in every word which has been uttered from the beginning. Even the words themselves it will sometimes alter in conformity with the new spirit which appears to pervade them.

The Gnostic and Alexandrian writings are a meeting point between the past and the future, in which the present is lost sight of, and ideas supersede facts. But something analogous is observable in the New Testament itself; which may be described also as the meeting point of past and future on the ground of the present, taking its origin not from ideas, but facts. The mode of thought of the age by

which the old is ever new, and the new ever entwined with the old, is common to both ; and language equally with thought seems to relax its bonds, and lose those harder lines of demarcation and definition which make it incapable of spiritual life. Gradually and naturally, as it were a soul entering into a body that had been prepared for it, the new takes the form of the old. Yet the very truth and power of the Gospel prevent this new creation from resembling the fantastic process of eastern heresy. The writers of the New Testament adopt the modes of speech and citation of their age, but they also ennoble and enlighten them. That traces of their age should appear in them is the necessary condition of their speaking to the men of their age. To mankind then, as to individuals now, God would have us speak in a language that they can understand.

Still, however striking may be the superficial similarity, essential differences lie beneath. There are three points which may be said to distinguish the manner in which the Old Testament is quoted in the New, from the manner in which early poets are quoted by heathen writers, or the Old Testament itself by Alexandrian or Christian authors. First, the Old Testament looks forward to the New, as the New Testament looks backward on the Old. Reading the psalmists or prophets, even with the veil on our eyes, which was also on theirs, we cannot but feel that they were pilgrims and strangers, looking for more than was on the earth, whose sadness was not yet turned into joy. There are passages in which the Old Testament goes beyond itself, in which it almost seems to renounce itself; even solitary expressions, of which it might be said, either in Christian or heathen language, "that it speaks not of itself;" or, that "its voice reaches to a thousand years." It is otherwise with heathen literature. There is no future to which Homer or Hesiod looked forward ; no higher moral truth beyond themselves which they dimly see. The life of the world was not to awaken in their song. They were poetry only, out of which came statues of gods and heroes. Secondly, if the connexion between the Old and New Testament be on the surface arbitrary, or, more properly speaking, after the manner of the age, that deeper connexion which lies below is founded on reason and conscience. The language of the greater part of the Old Testament

is the natural, may we not say the most true and inward, expression of Christian feeling. In the hour of sorrow, or joy, or repentance, or triumph, we seem to turn to the Old Testament even more readily than to the New. Thirdly and lastly, not to speak of the great difference in degree, a difference in kind is observable between the way in which quotations are made use of by the Alexandrian writers and in the New Testament. In the one they are the form of thought; in the other the mode of expression. That is to say, while in the one they exercise an influence on the thought; in the other, they are controlled by it, and are but a sort of incrustation on it, or ornament of it; in some cases the illustration or allegory through which it is conveyed. The writings of St. Paul are not the less one in feeling and spirit because the language in which he continually clothes his thoughts is either avowedly or unconsciously taken from the Old Testament.

Even in our own use of quotations we may observe a sort of necessary inconsistency which illustrates the mode of citation in the New Testament. We resort to quotation not only as an ingenious device for expressing our meaning; it is also an appeal to an authority. And yet its point or force frequently consists in a slight, or even a great, deviation from the sense in which a quotation was uttered by its author. Its aptness lies in its being at once old and new; often in bringing into juxtaposition things so remote, that we should not have imagined they were connected; sometimes in a word rather than in a sentence, even in the substitution of a word, or in a logical inference not wholly warranted.

Something analogous to this we find in the quotations of the New Testament. They unite a kind of authority with a new interpretation of the passage quoted. Sometimes the application of them is a sort of argument from their exact rhetorical or even grammatical form. Their connexion often hangs upon a word, and there are passages in which the word on which the connexion turns is itself inserted. There are citations too, which are a composition of more than one passage, in which the spirit is taken from one and the words from another. There are other citations in which a similarity of spirit, rather than of language, is caught up and made use of by the Apostle. There are

passages which are altered to suit the meaning given to them; or in which the spirit of the New Testament is substituted for that of the Old; or the spirit of the Old Testament expands into that of the New. Lastly, there are passages, though but few of them occur in the writings of St. Paul, which have one sense in the Old Testament, and have an entirely different or opposite one in the New. Almost all gradations occur between exact verbal correspondence with the Greek of the LXX.; and discrepancy in which resemblance is all but lost: between the greatest similarity and difference, almost opposition, of spirit in the original passage and its application. In no passage in the Epistles of St. Paul is there any certain evidence that the first connexion was present to the Apostle's mind.

The quotations in the writings of St. Paul may be classified under the following heads:—

i. Passages in which (α .) the meaning, and (β .) the words of the Old Testament are altered, or (γ .) both: the alterations, sometimes arising from no assignable cause, sometimes from a composition of passages.

ii. Passages in which (α .) the spirit or (β .) the language of the Old Testament is exactly retained, or with no greater variation of words than may be supposed to arise out of difference of texts, and no greater diversity of spirit than necessarily arises from the transfer of any passage in the Old Testament into another connexion in the New.

iii. Allegorical passages.

i. (1.) An instance in which the meaning of the quotation has been altered, and also in which the new meaning given to it is derived from another passage, occurs in Rom. ii. 24.: *τὸ γὰρ ὄνομα τοῦ Θεοῦ δι' ὑμᾶς βλασφημεῖται ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν*, where the Apostle is speaking of the scandal caused by the violence and hypocrisy of the Jews. The words are taken from Is. lii. 5.: *δι' ὑμᾶς διαπαντὸς τὸ ὄνομά μου βλασφημεῖται ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι*; where, however, they refer not to the sins of the house of Israel, but to their sufferings at the hand of their enemies. The turn which the Apostle has given the passage is gathered from Ez. xxxvi. 21—23.: *καὶ ἐφείσάμην αὐτῶν διὰ τὸ ὄνομά μου τὸ*

ἄγιον ὃ ἐβελήλωσαν οἶκος Ἰσραὴλ ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν οὗ εἰσήλθοσαν ἐκεῖ, κ. τ. λ.

A composition of passages occurs also in Rom. xi. 8., which appears to be a union of Is. vi. 9, 10. and xxix. 10. The play upon the word ἔθνη (nations = Gentiles) is repeated in Rom. iv. 17. (Gen. xvii. 5.), Gal. iii. 8. (Gen. xii. 3.).

(2.) A similar instance in which the general tone of a quotation is taken from one passage, and a few words added from another, is to be found in Rom. ix. 33.: ἰδοὺ τίθημι ἐν Ζιὼν λίθον προσκόμματος καὶ πέτραν σκανδάλου καὶ ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ' αὐτῷ οὐ καταισχυνθήσεται. The greater part of this passage occurs in Is. xxviii. 16.: ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐμβάλλω εἰς τὰ θεμέλια Σιὼν λίθον πολυτελεῖ ἔκλεκτον ἀκρογωνιαίον, ἔντιμον εἰς τὰ θεμέλια αὐτῆς καὶ ὁ πιστεύων οὐ μὴ καταισχυνθῇ. But the words λίθον προσκόμματος are introduced from Is. viii. 14. And the remainder of the passage (καὶ . . . καταισχυνθήσεται) is really inconsistent with these words, though both parts are harmonised in Him who is in one sense a stumblingstone and rock of offence; in another a foundation stone and chief corner stone.

(3.) A slighter example of alteration occurs in 1 Cor. iii. 19., where the Apostle quotes from Ps. xciv. 11.: κύριος γινώσκει τοὺς διαλογισμοὺς τῶν σόφων ὅτι εἰσὶ μάταιοι. Here the words τῶν σόφων are substituted for τῶν ἀνθρώπων in the LXX., which in this passage agrees with the Hebrew. They are required to connect the quotation in the Epistle with the previous verses. A similar instance of the introduction of a word (πᾶς) on which the point of an argument turns, occurs in Rom. x. 11.: λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφὴ πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ' αὐτῷ οὐ καταισχυνθήσεται, where the addition is the more remarkable, as the Apostle had quoted the words without πᾶς a few verses previously.

(4.) Another instance of addition, rather than alteration, is furnished by 1 Cor. xiv. 21.: ἐν τῷ νόμῳ γέγραπται ὅτι ἐν ἑτερογλώσσοις καὶ ἐν χεῖλεσιν ἐτέρων λαλήσω τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ, καὶ οὐδ' οὕτως εἰσακούσονται μου, λέγει κύριος. This quotation, which is said to be "written in the law" (comp. John, x. 34., xii. 34., xv. 25.), is from Is. xxviii. 11, 12., where the words in the LXX. are, διὰ φανλισμὸν χειλέων, διὰ γλώσσης ἐτέρας, ὅτι λαλήσουσι τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ, and in the English translation, "with stammering lips and another tongue will He speak unto this

people." But the last words, οὐδ' οὕτως εἰσακούσονται, are taken from the following verse, where a clause nearly similar occurs in a different connexion: λέγοντες αὐτοῖς, τοῦτο τὸ ἀνάπαντα τῷ πεινῶντι καὶ τοῦτο τὸ σύντριμμα, καὶ οὐκ ἠθέλησαν ἀκούειν, v. 12. The whole is referred by the Apostle to the gift of tongues, which he infers from this passage "to be a sign to unbelievers."

(5.) An adaptation, which has led to an alteration of words, occurs in Rom. x. 6—9.: ἡ δὲ ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοσύνη οὕτω λέγει· μὴ εἶπης ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου· τίς ἀναβήσεται εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν; τοῦτ' ἔστι χριστὸν καταγαγεῖν; ἢ τίς καταβήσεται εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον; τοῦτ' ἔστι χριστὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναγαγεῖν. ἀλλὰ τί λέγει; ἐγγύς σου τὸ ῥῆμά ἐστιν, ἐν τῷ στόματί σου καὶ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου· τοῦτ' ἔστι τὸ ῥῆμα τῆς πίστεως, ὃ κηρύσσομεν· ὅτι ἐὰν ὁμολογήσῃς ἐν τῷ στόματί σου κύριον Ἰησοῦν, καὶ πιστεύσῃς ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς αὐτὸν ἡγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν σωθήσῃ. The substance of this passage is taken from Deut. xxx. 11—14.: ὅτι ἡ ἐντολὴ αὐτῇ ἣν ἐγὼ ἐντέλλομαι σοι σήμερον οὐχ ὑπέρογκός ἐστιν, οὐδὲ μακρὰν ἀπὸ σοῦ ἐστίν· οὐκ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἄνω ἐστὶ, λέγων, τίς ἀναβήσεται ἡμῖν εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, καὶ λήψεται ἡμῖν αὐτὴν καὶ ἀκούσαντες αὐτὴν ποιήσομεν; οὐδὲ πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης ἐστὶ, λέγων, τίς διαπεράσει ἡμῖν εἰς τὸ πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης, καὶ λάβῃ ἡμῖν αὐτὴν, καὶ ἀκουσθὴν ἡμῖν ποιήσῃ αὐτὴν, καὶ ποιήσομεν; ἐγγύς σου ἐστὶ τὸ ῥῆμα σφόδρα, ἐν τῷ στόματί σου καὶ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου καὶ ἐν ταῖς χερσὶ σου ποιεῖν αὐτό. To these verses the Apostle has added what may be termed a running commentary, applying them to Christ. To make the words πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης thus applicable, the Apostle has altered them to εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον, a change which we should hesitate to attribute to him, but for the other examples which have been already quoted of similar changes. (Compare also Rom. xi. 8.; xii. 19.; Eph. v. 14. The latter passage, in which the name of Christ is introduced as here, being probably an adaptation of Is. lx. i.) Considering the frequency of such changes, it would be contrary to the rules of sound criticism to attribute the introduction of the words to a difference of text in the Old Testament.

(6.) The words of 1 Cor. xv. 45, οὕτως καὶ γέγραπται· Ἐγένετο ὁ πρῶτος Ἀδὰμ εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν ὁ ἔσχατος Ἀδὰμ εἰς πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν, afford a remarkable instance of discrepancy, both in words and

meaning, from Gen. ii. 7. : ἐνεφύσησεν εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ πνοὴν ζωῆς καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ ἄνθρωπος εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν; to the two clauses of which the Apostle appears to have applied a distinction analogous to that which Philo draws (De Legum Alleg. i. 12. ; De Creat. Mun. 24, 46.) between the earthly and the heavenly man (Gen. ii. 7. and i. 27.).

ii. A good example of the second class of quotations is the passage from Hab. ii. 4. quoted in Rom. i. 17.: ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται; which occurs also in two other places, Heb. x. 38., Gal. iii. 11., which the LXX. read: ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεώς μου ζήσεται, and the English version translates from the Hebrew, "but the just shall live by *his* faith." It is remarkable, that in Rom. i. 17. ; Gal. iii. 11. it should be quoted in the same manner, and that slightly different, either from the LXX. or the Hebrew ; in Heb. x. 38. it agrees precisely with the LXX. Like the other great text of the Apostle, "Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him for righteousness," it is an instance of the way in which the language of the Old Testament was enlarged and universalised in the New ; the particular faith of Abraham or of the Israelite becoming the type of faith generally for all mankind in all ages.

Other examples of the second class of quotations are to be found in such passages as the following : "Blessed is the man whose iniquity is forgiven, and whose sin is pardoned ; blessed is the man to whom the Lord doth not impute sin," Rom. iv. 7., from Ps. xxxii. 1, 2. "The reproaches of them that reproached thee fell on me," Rom. xv. 3., from Ps. lxix. 9. "Who hath believed our report ?" Rom. x. 16., from Is. liii. 1 ; in which the instinct of the Apostle has caught the common spirit of the Old and New Testament, though the texts quoted contain no word which is a symbol of his doctrine.

Passages which might be placed under either head are Rom. x. 13., "Jacob have I loved, and Esau have I hated," the words of which exactly agree with the LXX., although their original meaning in Mal. i. 2. 3., whence they are taken, has to do not with the individuals Jacob and Esau, but with the natives of Edom and Israel : the cento of quotations in Rom. iii. descriptive of the wickedness of the Psalmist's enemies, or of those who were the subjects of the prophetic denunciations, which are transferred by the Apostle to the

world in general, Rom. xii. 20., "Therefore if thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink: for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head," the words of which are exactly quoted from the LXX. (Prov. xxv. 21, 22.), though the meaning given to them is ironical; for which reason the succeeding clause, "But the Lord shall reward thee," which would have destroyed the irony, is omitted.

iii. Once more. In a few passages only the Apostle, after the manner of his time, has recourse to allegory. These are: 1. The allegory of the woman who had lost her husband, in Rom. vii.; 2. Of the children of Israel in the wilderness, in 1 Cor. x.; 3. Of Hagar and Sarah, in Gal. iii.; 4. Of the veil on the face of Moses, in 2 Cor. iii.; 5. Abraham himself, who is a kind of centre of allegory, the actions of whose life, as well as the promises of God to him, are symbols of the coming dispensation; 6. The history of the patriarchs, and cutting short of the house of Israel, in Rom. ix. x. Of these examples, the first, third, and fourth are what we should term illustrations; while the second, fifth, and sixth have not merely an analogous or metaphorical meaning, but a real inward connexion with the life and state of the first believers.

A few general results of an examination of the quotations from the Old Testament in St. Paul's Epistles, may be summed as follows:—

1. The whole number of quotations is about 87, of which about 53 are found in the Romans, 15 in the 1 Corinthians, 6 in 2 Corinthians, 10 in Galatians, 2 in the Ephesians, 1 in 1 Timothy. Of these nearly half show a precise verbal agreement with the LXX.; while of the remaining passages, at least two-thirds exhibit a degree of verbal similarity which can only be accounted for by an acquaintance with the LXX.

2. None of these passages offer any certain proof that the Apostle was acquainted with the Hebrew original. That he must have been acquainted with it can hardly be doubted; yet it seems improbable that he could have familiarly known it without straying into parallelisms with the Hebrew text, in those passages in which it varies from the LXX. His acquaintance with it was probably of such a kind as we might acquire of a version of the Scriptures not in the vernacu-

lar. No Englishman incidentally quoting the English version from memory would adapt it to the Greek, though he might very probably adapt the Greek to the English. On the other hand, the Apostle must have possessed a minute knowledge of the LXX., as is found by the fragmentary character of the quotations, no less than their verbal agreement.

3. Several of these quotations are what may be termed latent quotations, as *e. g.* Rom. iii. 4., x. 18.; 1 Cor. vi. 2., ix. 7., xv. 25. 27.; while a few others, as for example, Rom. xii. 19., 1 Cor. xv. 45., are hardly, if at all, discernible in the text of the Old Testament. The very familiarity with the Old Testament which has led to the first of these two phenomena, may be in part also the cause of the second. As the words suggest themselves unconsciously, so the spirit without the words occasionally comes into the Apostle's mind; or the language and spirit of different passages blend in one.

4. There is no evidence that the Apostle remembered the verbal connexion in which any of the passages quoted by him originally occurred. He isolates them wholly from their context; he reasons from them as he might from statements of his own, "going off upon a word," as it has been called, in one instance almost upon a letter (Gal. iii. 16.), drawing inferences which in strict logic can hardly be allowed, extending the meaning of words beyond their first and natural sense. But all this only implies that he uses quotations from the Old Testament after the manner of his age; clinging more to his contemporaries to the spirit and less to the letter, his very inaccuracy about the letter arising partly from his feeling for the spirit.

5. It seems strange that the Apostle should use the law to establish the law, and at the same time condemn the law by itself. What made him apply one text to the law, "The man that doeth these things shall live in them," and another to the Gospel, "The word is very nigh unto thee, even in thy mouth and in thy heart?" No answer can be given to this question. To separate the Old Testament into two parts, to throw away one half, and make the other the means of conveying the Gospel to the minds of his hearers, to bring forth from his treasury things new and old, and to harmonise all in one spirit, is a part of his appointed mission.

ST. PAUL AND PHILO.

"Canst thou speak Greek?" (Acts xxi. 37.) "Men and brethren, I am a Pharisee, the son of a Pharisee" (Acts xxiii. 6.), "brought up in this city at the feet of Gamaliel, and taught according to the perfect way of the law of the Fathers" (Acts xxii. 3.).

CHRISTIANITY admits of being regarded either from within or from without. We may begin with our own hearts, with the study of the word of God, with the received views which have grown up within the sphere of the Christian Church; or we may place ourselves without that sphere, and look upon Christianity under the aspect which it presented to the contemporaries of Seneca or Pliny; criticising its external facts, penetrating into and analysing its thought and spirit. Those who take this latter course are sometimes said to place themselves in a false position, which has no rest or stability, until the heavenly is all brought down to the level of the earthly, and the narrative of Scripture has passed into a merely human history. This feeling has been greatly strengthened by the circumstance that, of the age which immediately preceded Christianity in the land where it arose, so slight a record has been preserved to us. For the first century the Gospel stands in no assignable relation to the contemporary history even of the Jews themselves. There is a circle of light around the forms of Christ and his Apostles; while the world, in reference to our knowledge of it, lies in darkness. Naturally, we make no attempt to supply what may be termed "the blank leaves between the Old and New Testament," by gathering together a few doubtful fragments; while the Christian era furnishes a new begin-

ning, to go beyond which seems like asking "what preceded the creation of the world."

Nevertheless, the really false and artificial position is not that which unites, but that which separates Christianity from the world in general. Practical evils arise from this separation, which begins with history and ends with daily life. The Apostles said that they were men of like passions with ourselves: the world, too, was a world of men like ourselves; swayed by affections, opinions, traditions, requiring ideas to be on a level with human capacities and to be conveyed in an intelligible language. As our Saviour says of the second coming of the Son of man, it may also be said of the first, "they were marrying and were giving in marriage;" their ordinary life was what it had been before; the smoke of the daily sacrifice was still going up; they were disputing about purifying with the disciples of John, sitting at the feet of Gamaliel to be instructed in the Greek learning, of which he was reputed a master. They had their thoughts respecting Christ, the tribute money, the Roman government. They knew the difference between their own servile condition and the inheritance of their fathers, of which Moses, in the law, and the prophets spoke. There were zealots and Essenes among them, though not mentioned in the Gospel, who must have had something in common with the disciples of Christ, and yet more probably with those of John the Baptist. Jewish life was not wanting in individual features; those which have come down to us in the narrative of the Evangelists being such only as contrast most strikingly with the life and sayings of our Lord and his Apostles. Nor were the Jews in the time of Christ without a literature, which had overgrown the Old Testament. Even in Palestine itself they were familiar with the version of the LXX. That "the traditions of the Fathers" had formed a part of the education of St. Paul is proved by his allusions to them in the Epistles, no less than by his express statement.

As the "new man" is not altogether different from the old, but retains many elements of the same character, so did the Christian world retain many elements of the Jewish and heathen world which preceded it. As in ages that we know, the earthly and the heavenly,

the Church and the world, have ever been mingled together, both within and without us, so in the first age with which we are acquainted only from the record of Scripture itself, the wheat and the tares were growing together; the Church was not without antecedents in history, and had many points of contact with the world. Nor must we confine the connexion of cause and effect to mere external events, such as the fall of Jerusalem or the extension or decay of the Roman Empire, which had a political influence on the fortunes of the infant Communion. There is a sequence of thoughts as well, by which age is bound to age; and that which in one generation is "sown in corruption" is in the next "raised in incorruption;" scattered fragments unite into an harmonious whole; what was barren speculation once, becomes a practical rule of life; forms of thought spiritualise themselves; language dead for ages awakens into life.

Of these internal influences, the one which has most affected the history of Christianity is the Jewish Alexandrian philosophy, which has supplied not only the language of a great part of Scripture, but also what may be termed the mode or structure of the thought. Persons have sometimes spoken of modern civilisation and literature including in itself two elements, a Semitic and a Greek one; we shall find that the fusion between them had already taken place in the first century of the Christian era; of any Hebrew Gospel earlier than the New Testament, if ever written down, we know nothing. The soil in which the Gospel grew up was already more than half Greek. It is partly owing to this original unity that Christianity in after ages was capable of being "built up" from Greek philosophy, as well as from "the Scriptures of the prophets." It was like, though wholly unlike, the world around it. This difference and resemblance we are about to consider, not with the view of solving the problem of the origin of Christianity, still less of explaining it as the mere result of human thought; but as answering some difficulties, as throwing a new light on the language of Scripture, and, it may be added, as a subject which, in England, has not met with the attention which it deserves.

When, turning away from the heavenly origin of Christianity, we trace the first steps of its earthly progress, we cannot avoid putting

the question to ourselves, how it was made intelligible to the minds of Jews, who had been trained in a religion and way of thinking so different from it. The difficulty is analogous to that which our own missionaries experience in attempting to explain to the Chinese or the American Indians the nature of God. Their language has no words to express what is meant, or only words the associations of which confuse or mislead. The same difficulty must have pressed upon the first teachers of the Gospel. Where did they find words in which to express themselves? Whence came the forms of speech and modes of thought which, for nearly eighteen centuries, have been the symbols and landmarks of Christian theology? Some of them are derived from the Old Testament, but many are peculiar to the New; and those which are common to both often receive a new turn of signification in the Christian use of them, which needs explanation. For example, the words λόγος (the Word), πνεῦμα (the Spirit), the idea of the Son of God, or the son of man, would have been unmeaning to those who were told of them for the first time, and had nothing analogous in their own thought or speech. To have given a Greek in the time of Socrates a notion of what was meant by the Holy Spirit would have been like giving the blind a conception of colours, or the deaf of musical sounds. Other ideas of the Gospel, as grace, faith, mercy, life, death, which occur in the Old Testament, are nevertheless used there in a sense so partial and so different from that of the New, that an intermediate step has to be supplied before we can understand how they could have taken hold on the minds of men, as the expressions of the truths which were revealed in the Gospel.

Parallel to this difficulty, another deficiency in our knowledge has also to be mentioned. As uneducated persons imagine that the authorised English version is the original of the Scriptures, so even scholars are apt to think and write as though the Greek of the New Testament were the original tongue in which Christianity was first taught. But our Lord and his Apostles were Galileans, whose familiar language could never have been Greek. There was, if we may use an expression which sounds almost like a contradiction in terms, a Hebrew Christianity yet earlier than the New Testament the memorials of which are preserved to us in the translation only. How did this Hebrew Christianity pass into a language so different

as the Greek? All languages (and ancient ones yet more than modern) have their peculiar associations, among which those of religion are the strongest. The Greek language, as written by Plato or by Sophocles, notwithstanding its artistic beauty and power, is little calculated to be the medium of a spiritual religion. And yet, in the New Testament, we find classical words, such as *χάρις*, *πίστις*, *πνεῦμα*, not used doubtfully, or for the first time, or with explanations, but with a sort of confidence they will be understood by the reader or hearer, and with a system that implies they must have been long in use in this or a nearly similar signification.

These two questions are closely connected, and the answer to both may be gathered, to a great extent, from the Jewish Alexandrian philosophy. There the missing link is supplied; we see that the Greek and Hebrew mind had already bridged the chasm that separated them, and that the Greek language had, long before the times of our Lord and His Apostles, been forced into the service of Jewish thoughts. The Jew and the Greek met together in Alexandria, and the strangest eclectic philosophy that the world has ever seen, was the result of their union. It was Judaism and Platonism at once; the belief in a personal God assimilated to the doctrine of ideas. The Jew of Alexandria had lost nothing of the intense devotion to the law which was to be found among his Palestine brethren; only coming, as he did, under an opposite influence, from which he could not detach himself, he sought to add to the book of the law the speculations of Plato and Aristotle; or rather, however paradoxical it may seem, thought he saw in both a deep-rooted identity. During two centuries this composite system had been attaining a kind of consistency; it had acquired a philosophical language of its own, and had modes of interpreting the Old Testament which, in the age of Philo, had already become traditional. Alexandrianism gave the form and thought; Judaism the life and power. The God, who brought up his people out of the land of Egypt, was still stronger than the ideal image of the same God revealing himself in Greek philosophy; while from Greek philosophy the Jew of Alexandria borrowed those distinctions which enabled him to conceive more perfectly the abstraction of the Divine nature.

Philo, the only philosopher of this school whose works have come down to us, except in fragments, fortunately lived at a time which renders them peculiarly valuable for the purpose of our inquiry: According to the tradition of the Rabbis, he is said to have flourished about a hundred years before the destruction of the temple. But his own writings give us the date more certainly and accurately; as, from the "Legatio ad Caium," in which he describes himself as an old man (*ἡμεῖς οἱ γέροντες τὰ μὲν σώματα χρόνου μήκει πόλιοι*, Mangey, ii. 545.), it appears that he was sent on an embassy from Alexandria to Rome in the reign of Caligula, and was at Rome at the time Caligula attempted to place his statue in the temple at Jerusalem (Mangey, ii. 583.); also between the years 39 A. D., the date of the German victory to which he makes allusion (Mangey, ii. 598.,) and 41., which was the year of Caligula's death. If, therefore, we suppose Philo to have been at Rome in the year 40, and at that time, as the expression quoted above seems to imply, not less than 60 years of age, we may place the date of his birth at 20 B.C. All his extant writings are probably earlier than the "Legatio ad Caium," and therefore before A.D. 40.

Thus we see that in reading Philo we are on the very edge of Christianity. Philo might have seen and spoken with our Lord, and possibly did so in the visit to the temple which he mentions (Mangey, ii. 646.). Were it not for the distance between Alexandria and Judea, we should say that he must have breathed the very same air, and been educated in the same belief and ways of thought, as the first disciples. He would have been just what Apollos of Alexandria was before his conversion, "an eloquent man, learned in the Scriptures." Nor does there seem any reason to doubt that the speculations of Alexandria and a knowledge of the Greek language had been transplanted to Judea. The coincidences between Philo, and St. Paul, and St. John are a sufficient evidence that such must have been the case. For how did these coincidences arise? Either by Philo copying from St. Paul, which we have seen is already refuted by dates; or by St. Paul copying from Philo, a supposition which the dates admit of, but is otherwise wholly impossible; or by their

both adopting a mode of thinking and a language which had already become familiar to the Jews, an hypothesis which moreover exactly answers to the kind of difference that we find between them.

These similarities render Philo a mine of illustration for the language of the New Testament, to which no heathen author can in the least degree be compared. Between Polybius and the Gospel of St. Luke, or the Epistles of St. Paul, there is an interval of more than two hundred years, while St. Paul and Philo seem almost to touch. Not only should we expect their usage of words, but their figures of speech to be in great measure the same; the allegory of the Old Testament, which was the garment of philosophy to the one, was the revelation of the Gospel to the other.*

Philo is bound up with his age and country, of the literary character of which his writings are the chief monument. The key to them is the character of that age, viewed in connexion with which, they are a curious chapter in the history of the human mind; apart from it they bear only the appearance of learned trifling. No real

* In the following sketch I have to acknowledge many obligations to Gfrörer's work, "*Philo und die Jüdisch-Alexandrinische Theologie*," which was the first, and is still the best and most complete inquiry into the present subject. In one or two respects only he appears unsatisfactory. 1st. He has exaggerated the resemblances between Philo and the New Testament, making them, I think, more real and less verbal than they are in fact. 2ndly. From the very plan of his work there arises an impression which is disadvantageous to the New Testament, as he brings together in one the coincidences scattered through many volumes, and which, as we read them in Philo himself, have less of prominence and importance. 3rdly. He loses sight of the difference of spirit in the New Testament and Philo, which is indeed as great as between light and darkness, or between religion and mysticism. 4thly. It appears doubtful whether, as he supposes, Philo had a system of philosophy independent of the Mosaic writings. Is he not rather a theologian than a philosopher? Like modern theologians who have fallen under the influence of systems of philosophy in the interpretation of Scripture, he applied the Neoplatonism of his day to the interpretation of the Mosaic writings, which form the true circle in which his system is contained.

Brandis and Dahne (*Dr. Smith's Dictionary of Biography*, Art. Philo,) object also to Gfrörer's division of the writings of Philo into two classes, Historical and Allegorical. Mysticism so completely pervades all Philo's works, with the exception of the "*Legatio ad Caium*" and "*Contra Flaccum*," that a greater or less degree of it cannot safely be made a ground of discrimination between them.

phenomenon of the human mind is thus unmeaning; either in past times or present, or both together, there is that which, by contrast or association, may enable us to understand its true nature. The age of the Alexandrian philosophy has a deceitful resemblance with our own, and yet in many respects is more different from us than the classical times of Greece and Rome. It has forms of logic and rhetoric, and abundance of abstract terms, in which all ideas are moulded and balanced; yet combined with this rhetorical accuracy and nicety, there is an utter absence of reasoning and speculation. We should be tempted to consider Alexandrianism as a philosophical language and nothing more (which in a scientific point of view it is), had it not, during many centuries, exerted so vast an influence on the minds of men. Besides this overlogical and overrhetorical character, another peculiarity of the age is antiquarianism; it is encumbered with the remembrance of the past. Nature had once overpowered and carried captive the mind of man; books now did so. The same devotion, which had formerly dwelt with awe on the terrors of the world without, now turned with mystic reverence to the letter of ancient writings. The earlier Greek philosophy was without antecedents; it came fresh from the soul of the philosopher, casting his eyes downward on the earth beneath his feet, and upward to the blue sky. It was a new birth; its connexion even with mythology was unconscious. But the secondary age of which we are speaking, learned rather than original, having a form of speculation without the power of it, ever recurring to the past, yet utterly devoid of true criticism or of historical insight, was embarrassed with the ideas of a prior world which it could neither accept nor reject, having too its own further ground from which it was equally impossible to recede. There was no other way but to carry past philosophies in its train, uniting them all with each other and with itself, as fancy or association might suggest.

Philosophy has been sometimes regarded as the free effort of the human mind towards the attainment of truth by abstract ideas. Nothing could less truly describe the character of the Alexandrian school, which was the creation of circumstances, predestined from its birth to be what it was. It had no capacity of resisting new thoughts,

from whatever source they were intruded. The therapeute of Alexandria could no more disengage himself from the worship of ideas than the Greek of Homer's time from the Greek mythology. Some plastic power fashioned anew in his mind the impressions which he received. No one asked is this reasonable, is this consistent, is there any proof of this? Every influence mingled and was reflected. The age was overeducated for its natural force. Never perhaps has there existed another age, with so much apparent cultivation, so utterly a stranger to the first principles of knowledge.

This philosophy received a peculiar character from its connexion with Judaism. As in later times the Christian Fathers, when they passed beyond the immediate circle of Christianity, awoke to the fact that God had not left Himself without a witness, even in the writings of Greek philosophers, so, too, the Jew of Alexandria, first coming into contact with the stores of heathen wisdom, "the good, the beautiful, and the true," could not fail of receiving a more than transient impression from them. But to such a mind the difficulty could not but arise,—Whence had these men such wisdom? The received answer with Philo was that they had it from Moses himself. Plato, Aristotle, Socrates, were implicitly contained in the Pentateuch; nay, they are even blamed for not acknowledging the source whence they derived their wisdom. Moses himself "at an early age attained the very summits of philosophy," (Philo de Creat. Mun., c. 2.), or, in the language of Scripture, was "learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians." In the same spirit that the heathen Neoplatonist invented travels of Plato and Pythagoras in Egypt or India, as he obtruded upon them oriental conceptions, did the Jew of Alexandria assert that the connexion which his own wayward fancy had invented between Plato and Moses was based upon an historical fact.

A great interval seems to separate the Platonic ideas from "the Lord God who brought up the children of Israel out of the house of Egypt." In Plato the ideas come first; they are prior to all phenomena, and any attempt to describe them as residing in an infinite mind reaches beyond his conception of them. But the Alexandrian philosophy had made this further step; its ideas were already embodied in a person; and, on the other hand, the conception of God,

which was held by the Israelite himself, was not absolutely the same with that which had prevailed in the earlier period of Jewish history. Change of time and place had exercised an influence on the Jewish faith; it had become more a philosophy and less a mode of life. The scenes of the history of the Jews, witnessed by so many local monuments, were afar off. They were dwelling in a foreign country, and using a foreign language; they had adopted the Greek version of the Scriptures; many of them were leading a peculiar ascetic life. The temple and the temple sacrifices were in another land, seen through distance, solemn religious ideas, rather than outward and visible facts. The Jew of Alexandria, "*homo desideriorum*," still sought for something more than this, and confessed that in Egypt at least "he was a stranger and pilgrim upon the earth."

The great instrument whereby Greek philosophy was brought into harmony with the Jewish Scriptures, was allegorical interpretation. When the belief in the Greek mythology began to wax dim, two means were taken to breathe into it the breath of life. First it was allegorised; secondly, it was rationalised. From the second of these methods, even if it could have been applied to the Hebrew Scriptures, the mind of the Israelite would have turned away with disgust. But the first of them was just suited to his fancy; even his reverence for the letter of Scripture tended to foster rather than to discourage it. For what unknown mysteries might he not expect to find there? What wonder if God spake not to His servant Moses as one man speaks to another? It was not to be expected that the divine language should be easy and intelligible; rather it might be supposed that a labyrinth of truths would lurk behind every numeral or particle. The whole system of Philo might be described as rhetoric turned logic; ignorant of the true nature of language, presuming on its accuracy, allowing nothing for its uncertainty and irregularity, he infers endless consequences from trivial expressions. "He says this, he does not say that;" therefore some false and far-fetched deduction is to be drawn. "His expressions are the most perfect that can be conceived, yet how do they fall short of his thought!" "Every where there are marks of design, in the structure of sentences no less than in the creation of the world." "It cannot be supposed that an inspired

writer would use one word instead of another without good reason." The worst extravagances of mystical interpretation among the Fathers, combined with the most tedious platitudes of a modern sermon, convey a faint idea of the manner in which Philo "improves" Scripture.

A few other characteristics of his system will serve as an introduction to some account of the system itself.

First, he is absolutely devoid of any historical sense of truth. He has no perception of the characters about whom he is speaking, or the scenes in which they lived. The features which he attributes to them are generally taken for some chance expression or accidental circumstance. There is no attempt to group them in one, or analyse their connexion with each other; he is incapable of comprehending them as men of like passions with ourselves. To him they are types and symbols of which he reads in the Book of the Law. It would not be true to say that his interpretations uniformly supersede the historical meaning; but, on the other hand, he is wholly indifferent to it. Again and again where any narrative in the Book of the Law seems to him unworthy of the writer, or discordant with his own belief—he turns aside into the flowery paths of allegory. He would sooner a thousand times renounce the meaning of the text, than admit in the earlier chapters of Genesis a visible appearance of God. Secondly, he, in general, pays no regard to the connexion of a passage; each clause, each word is considered by itself, so that even if we were to admit the principles of his interpretations, the whole narrative is hardly ever consistent with itself; sometimes a new connexion is elicited by reading the passage crosswise, just as we can imagine a person with a wrong key, yet by the help of enthusiasm and a flexible system of symbols, interpreting the hieroglyphics, or the Sinaitic inscriptions. Thirdly, in his interpretations he adopts fixed types; as sheep for the affections, holes for the senses; a field is explained to mean a struggle, Egypt is the seat of the passions, Cain means folly and also possession. The very uniformity with which these types are used is one proof among many that Philo was not the first inventor of them, but that they were conventional among his countrymen. Fourthly, it may be observed that his almost entire ignorance of Hebrew leads him to build solely on the Greek text, in

the explanation of which he often seeks to elicit a profound meaning from mere awkwardness of translation. Thus, for instance, he says that the word *προσέθηκε*, in the account of the birth of Abel, implies a previous *ἀφαίρεσις* (Mangey, i. 163.), and that *θανάτῳ θανατούμεθα* in the narrative of the fall, i. 65., must refer to two kinds of death, for how, he asks, can a man die except by death?

The system of Philo is at once mystical and logical. Mysticism is the end, logic is the means, if, indeed, that can be termed logic which is absolutely devoid of the first principles of reasoning. Philo regarded the allegorical interpretation as a sort of secondary inspiration with which he was himself gifted; he had often felt its power in composition, when, as he himself tells us, new ideas came into his mind, he knew not from whence. "He was empty and became full; thoughts rained into his soul from above; he was in a trance, and had a flow of interpretation, and an enjoyment of light." (i. 441.) Those who partook of the same gift were *ἱεροί, καθαροί, μῦσαι* (i. 147.); he exhausts in their praises all the terms which the heathen applied to the initiated. The select few only were thus inspired; unlike "to the poor the Gospel is preached," *τῶν ἀγγελίων οὐδεὶς* says Philo, *τῆς ἀληθοῦς ζωῆς κεκοινωνήκε* (no common man hath part in the true life). But the allegorical interpretation was also a dialectical art. As the Patristical explanations of Scripture were under a rule of authority, as in our own interpretations of the Book of Revelation, a certain uniformity may be observed, notwithstanding the many discrepancies of detail, so the allegory of Philo was not without a settled principle. He himself speaks of *τοὺς τῆς ἀλληγορίας κανόνας* (the Canons of allegory). Its first symbols, such as the sun for reason, or the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, were such as the common sense of all men, or the text itself, naturally suggested. In after times they were neither natural nor arbitrary, but fixed by use and the authority of eminent teachers. The interpretation of them, like the interpretation of tongues in the New Testament, was a religious service. Philo speaks of the Essenes in Palestine and the Therapeutæ in the neighbourhood of the lake Mœris (ii. 458. 475.), as meeting together on the Sabbath day, and above all on the Sabbath of Sabbaths, to interpret the law in its hidden sense. They had *συγγράμματα παλαιῶν ἀνδρῶν* (compilations of ancient men), from which they

taught, and hymns which formed a part of the worship. Philo's own writings are a sufficient indication that new discoveries were not excluded. He reads the book of the law, like a sacred hieroglyph containing endless symbols, and hard to be understood, in which one sign has many meanings, and many signs are applied to the same truth.

The system of Philo might, in one point of view, be regarded as his method of interpreting the Mosaic Scriptures. For without this he has no system. All his thoughts are incrustated on the divine word; it would be a violence to arrange them independently. It seemed to him that God had only revealed Himself to the Jewish people; and accordingly the glosses and patchwork of Greek philosophy which he introduces into the text, are not additions of his own, but its natural meaning. Or, to state the same thing in a way which is more paradoxical, and yet better expresses his view, the Mosaic law was the natural and original form of the Platonic and Alexandrian philosophy.

His writings include nearly a complete series of commentaries on the Book of the Law. No other books form the subject of any of his separate works. Many are not even mentioned by him; the few that are mentioned supplying but a small number of quotations, not, perhaps, altogether more than one in twenty compared with the books of Moses. It is not certain that Philo excluded any of our received books from the Canon of Scripture; but neither is there any proof that the idea of the Canon was known to him at all. Neither Samuel, David, Solomon, nor Job, nor indeed any one later than Joshua, is mentioned by name. In repeating the famous narrative of the LXX. interpreters, he says nothing of them, but confines the miracle to the Pentateuch. The prophets are commonly quoted by him in a singular manner, with the introduction, *εἰπέ τις τῶν πάλαι προφητῶν*, or *τις τῶν φοιτητῶν Μωϋσέως*. Their words are chiefly used in illustration, and not made the basis of allegorical interpretations. Taking all these circumstances together, we cannot doubt that in the view of Philo the law was separated by a wide chasm from the rest of the Old Testament, as the narrative of the patriarchs, and the giving of the law must have been also regarded by him in a very different light from the later Jewish history.

It is in the Pentateuch, and especially in the history of the creation,

and the lives of the patriarchs, that his mystic fancy delights to revel. A short analysis of his treatise "De Mundi Creatione," including as it does most of his peculiarities, will give the reader an idea of his method of proceeding. His commentary on the first chapter is as follows:—

1. 2. He begins with the praises of Moses, whose thoughts are indeed beyond all praise; who had gone to the very end of philosophy, and knew well that there must be a δραστήριον ὄργανον (an active instrument), that is God, and a παθητικὸν ὄργανον (a passive instrument), without life or motion, answering to intellect and matter, which latter it were absurd to suppose without beginning. He says that God made the world in six days, not because He had need of time, but because six is a perfect number, capable of being divided by two, by three, and by six, and is male and female, and odd and even (ἀρτιοπέριττος). And before God created it He made an intellectual world (κόσμος νοητός) to be the paradigm and idea of it, which is none other but the reason of God (ἀρχέτυπον παράδειγμα, ἰδέα τῶν ἰδεῶν, ὁ Θεοῦ λόγος). This he did, as one of old said (Plato, Tim. 29.), "because He was good, which goodness of His He imparts to all things as they are able to bear it."

Still confining himself to the intellectual world, Philo goes on to remark that the words in the beginning (ἐν ἀρχῇ) must be explained not of time, for time had not yet come into existence, but of number and order (non in tempore sed cum tempore finxit Deus mundum Augus.) He describes the form of the heaven and empty space which God made after the pattern of His own mind, the chiefest things in which were light and air, the images of the reason of God, and of the spirit of God. Thus the creation of the intellectual world had an end. To mark its isolation from the rest, the word used in the fifth verse of the 1st chapter of Genesis is not "the first day" (πρώτη), but "one day" (μία).

He next discourses of the heaven which is the visible boundary of the world (οὐρανὸς ὅρος ὑπαρύς), of the "sea and dry land," and of the fruits of the earth, which latter, he observes, grew up in a moment, and yet were intended by Providence to be eternal. He remarks on the apparent inconsistency of the plants springing up before the sun, which he thinks was done to show the creative power of God, who

was capable of acting no less without than with the intervention of second causes. He then speaks of the creation of the sun on the fourth day, which was not of choice, but of necessity, seeing the number four is possessed of so many and such wonderful properties.

Fishes, birds, and beasts, were next created in a continuous series, and at the last God made man in His own image ; not that God is in the form of man, but that the mind is to man what God is to the world. He says let "*us*" make man, not as of one but as of many. Why is the plural used? Philo is uncertain how to explain this, but thinks that it may arise from the fact, that God was creating a being of mixed nature, in whom He Himself implanted the good, and employed angels to assist in adding the evil. Next, the question arises, —Why did God create man last? Four answers are given to this inquiry:—1st, because God, having given man reason, desired to provide a theatre for his intelligence, and also, 2ndly, to furnish him with the means of supplying his natural wants (for in the state of innocence the earth produced all things necessary for the good of man, and may do so again if men cease from their wickedness); 3rdly, by reason of the order of His work, which required that He should place man, the highest of corruptible things, at the end, as He has placed heaven, the highest of incorruptible things, at the beginning; 4thly, man was created last to be the master of the rest; he is the pilot, the herdsman, the driver of the inferior animals.

(From a comparison of the commentary on the next chapter, it appears that Philo is here speaking, not of the actual but of the ideal man. Finding in chap. iii. a recommencement of the history of the creation of man, he knew no way to account for it except by this distinction.)

When the heavens and the earth were completed, God hallowed the seventh day. Here Philo branches forth into the praises of the number seven, in a digression which occupies many pages. He first divides seven into two kinds, *ἔκτος τῆς δέκαδος* and *περιεχόμενον ἐν τῇ δέκαδι* (outside ten and within ten), meaning, by the first of the two, arithmetical progression of seven numbers, with intervals of twos or threes, containing the image of cube and square, of essence and superficies. Again, he takes the simple number seven, and shows

all the modes in which its units are combined, and how their harmonies are the first principles of music and geometry. Seven is like God, "neither begetting nor begotten" (οὔτε γεννῶν οὔτε γεννώμενος); like Victory, whom poets fable to have had no mother; like Minerva, springing at once out of the head of Divinity. It agrees with nature, and, if multiplied by four, answers to the time of the moon (28). Solon and Hippocrates tell of the seven ages of man. It is a cube and a plain figure at once. All nature is in love with it. There are 7 planets, 7 zones, 7 Pleiades, 7 senses, 7 parts of the human body, 7 secretions, 7 motions, 7 months' children, 7 strings to the lyre, 7 vowels, &c. Great as it is, it is appropriately named ἀπὸ τοῦ σέβασ-μοῦ and σεμνοῦ (ἑπτα=septem).

At ver. 4. of chap. ii. he dwells on the form of the sentence, "These are the generations of the heavens and of the earth when they were created in the day that the Lord God made the earth and the heavens, and every plant of the field *before* it was in the earth, and every herb of the field *before* it grew." This, he says, refers to the intellectual world, which was completed *before* the actual world came into existence. Next he enlarges upon the 6th verse,— "then went up a mist (in the LXX., fountain) from the earth," in reference to which he remarks upon the wonderful sagacity of Moses, who distinguished the ocean, the fourth element, from fresh water, which, like the catamenia in women, existed in the bosom of the earth.

Next man was formed; not he of whom we spoke before, who was in the image of God, and belonged only to the intellectual world, but visible to sight, and with distinction of sex. He was formed in the best manner, doubtless for many reasons:—First, because the earth of which he was made was recently separated from water; secondly, because it was clay; thirdly, because God is good. He was created in the youth of all things, inferior to the ideal man, but far superior to anything which we can now show, for the copies have been becoming weaker, the attraction of the magnet fainter, by being imparted. He came not into a world of solitude, but to a great city full of corporeal and incorporeal essences. He is both mortal and immortal, made up of the four elements, and at once terrestrial, aquatic, volatile, celestial. Neither have his posterity altogether lost

their pre-eminence, for they still rule over the brute creation, which God, as soon as he was created, asked him to name; not because He could be ignorant Himself, but that He might hear him exercising his reason in its most pure and perfect state.

Thus far he was in the image of God alone upon the earth. Woman was the beginning of his guilt. He saw the double and half of himself (*διττὰ τμήματα* of Plato's Symposium), and was led by the impulse of desire to unite himself therewith. This was the commencement of bodily pleasure. Before this God had planted a garden in Paradise of trees bearing immortal fruit. Not that there really *could* have been such a place; but Paradise means the reason, and the myriad plants are opinions, and the trees of good and evil are prudence and piety; and the serpent is the symbol of pleasure, sent by God to seduce the woman (who is in fact *αἴσθησις*, "sense," the feminine part of our nature), who in her turn seduced the reason.

Philo proceeds:—"Now these things are not mythical inventions, such as delight the herd of poets and of sophists, but they are types inviting to allegory in accordance with their secret meaning." He then follows out the various symbols in detail. God sent a curse upon man and upon all creation. He might have destroyed them, but of His infinite mercy He allowed them to remain.

Philo concludes by a summary of five things which he says Moses incidentally teaches in his history of Creation. I. That there is a God, against atheists. II. That He is one God, against those who transfer to heaven the meanest form of human governments, an ochlocracy. III. That the world was created. IV. That this created world was one like its Creator. V. That there is a Providence. Happy is he who knows this!

In this brief analysis of a considerable work, it has been impossible to do justice to its rhetorical, or, in a few passages, to its poetical character. It gives, however, a fair notion of many of Philo's peculiarities, such as the extraordinary importance which he attaches to principles of number, and the manner in which he builds startling theories on hypercritical remarks on the language, and even on miserable etymologies. It illustrates, further, the mode in which he presses heathen writers into the service of the books of Moses. Ne-

cessity, or rather some numerical law, is always in the background: the remembrance of Plato, and even of the categories of Aristotle, is never far off. The passage in which he speaks of the use of the plural in the creation of man, and not, as he expressly remarks, of the inanimate creation, is remarkable as indicating a close connexion between his view and the Gnostic or Oriental doctrine, that God made evil with the assistance of an inferior angel or demiurge. Lastly, the distinction which he attempts to establish between a myth and a type is worthy of attention, as, however arbitrary his method of proceeding may appear, it indicates his unshaken belief that he had discovered the true objective meaning of the Book of the Law.

The commentary which commences with the narrative of the creation, is carried through the rest of the book of Genesis, and extends also to the books of Exodus and Leviticus. Philo is especially full on the lives of the Patriarchs, whom he regards as *τρόποι ψυχῆς*, and *ἔμψυχοι νόμοι*. Thus Abraham is the type of the good man, *ἐκ διδασκαλίας*; Isaac, *ἐκ φύσεως*; Jacob, *ἐξ ἀσκήσεως*. Sarah is *τρόπος τῆς ἀρετῆς γενικῆς*; Leah, *τῆς ἀρετῆς μισοῦμένης*; Joseph is the *πολιτικός* (Mangey, ii. 9.). Of the earlier ones, Adam is the *ἄνθρωπος γηγενής*, or *χοϊκός*; Cain is the type of covetousness; Enos of hope; Enoch of repentance (this explanation apparently arises out of a misconception of the word *μετέθηκε* in the LXX., see Mangey, ii. 3, 4.; Noah of righteousness. (Mangey, ii. 3. 5. 9. 36. 408 — 416.). Nor is it merely the names or general characters of the Patriarchs in which he finds materials for symbolism. The commonest statements respecting them, or the simplest events of their lives, receive a similar explanation. Take the following as an illustration, (Mangey, i. 466. ii. 11, 12.):—Philo is commenting on the narrative of Abraham going forth from Ur of the Chaldees to dwell in Haran. Ur, he says, signifies astrology; Haran signifies holes, that is, the senses: if we put both together, the meaning of God's command will be,—“Leave thy Chaldean astrology;” cease contemplating the world around thee, and contemplate thyself. Thy senses will teach thee a new lesson, that they are nothing without the soul. Immediately after this, he remarks, that God appeared to Abraham: *ὁ Θεὸς ὥφθη τῷ σοφῷ*, not,

he remarks, ὁ σοφὸς εἶδε Θεόν, for no man can know God except so far as God reveals Himself to him. In this he finds a proof of the truth of his explanation, as also in the circumstance, that at this time God changed the name Abram, which he interprets "sublime father," occupied with Chaldean astronomy, into Abraham, which means, he tells us, "elect father of sound;"—elect referring to his goodness, sound meaning speech or language, and father=mind. The last pilgrimage from Haran to Palestine he explains to mean, the progress from sense to the true and perfect knowledge of God.

One more example may close this portion of the subject. In the book, "de Somniis," Philo takes occasion to explain the verses, Gen. xxviii. 10, 11., Ἰακώβ ἐπορεύθη εἰς χαρρὰν καὶ ὑπῆντησε τόπῳ καὶ ἐκοιμήθη ἐκεῖ, ἔδυν γὰρ ὁ ἥλιος, (Mangey, i. 638.). The explanation is as follows: while the ascetic, ὁ ἀσκήτης, lived in the senses, he met the divine word (who, as the fulness of all spiritual power committed to him by God, is symbolised by place). "For the sun went down," i. e., in other words, the light of human reason had set, or, according to another interpretation, the word appeared when the light of the divine presence had set. It is scarcely necessary to dwell on the perversity and inconsistency of this explanation, which seems to have arisen from Philo attaching a fixed meaning, which we find recurring in other places for the same words: for Haran the senses, for τόπος either God or the λόγος, for ἥλιος the light of divine or human reason. The problem was, how these three counters could be connected with each other.

After furnishing some of these and several similar examples, Gröfner concludes by quoting the line from Hamlet :—

"Though this be madness, yet there's method in it."

Madness it is according to both the definitions of it :—reasoning rightly from wrong premises, or wrongly from right premises. Many other instances might be quoted, showing not only the absurdity but the self-contradiction of Philo's interpretation. He constantly forgets what he has himself said a page before. Not only is his method based on an eclectic philosophy, but he seems incapable of carrying through two successive verses any unity of sense or idea.

The inquiry thus far pursued, tends to throw a favourable light on the mystical interpretation of the early Christian Fathers. For the utmost that can be said against them is, that they were on a level with their age, and did not shake off the scholastic trammels in which they had been brought up. The allegorical method was as natural in their day as the devotional or critical in our own. It had existed four centuries before them: it seemed to be the only means of making use of the Old Testament Scriptures. If from time to time they are found making extravagant suppositions to support a favourite theory, playing with words, numbers, or colours, reading the Old Testament backwards, that they may absolutely identify it with the New, we may compare them first with Philo, secondly with ourselves. (1.) They occasionally allegorise numbers; he, it may be said, never misses the opportunity: they in a very few instances supersede the historical meaning; he can scarcely be said to allow the historical meaning to stand at all. The difference, though one only of degree, is yet so great as to be almost a difference in kind. That the Fathers were great critics will not be maintained; but they were almost as far as any modern historian from the dreamy inconsecutive apprehension of historical facts which we find in Philo, who is as entirely devoid of the historical sense as an Indian philosopher. In another point of view, Philo may be regarded as a witness in their favour, inasmuch as his writings show the extraordinary power which in that age the allegorical system exercised in the world. It seems as if mankind, after being raised above things of sense by the progress of the human mind, relapsed again into the world of sense; and instead of gathering the true lesson from them, sought to find in individual objects the conductors to an invisible world. From this influence, the Fathers, in a great degree, freed themselves. They may be defended, not only by the plea that they were on a level with their age, but that they were above their age.

(2.) It will make us more lenient, both towards Philo and the Fathers, to remember, that the method which they employ has not ceased to be practised by ourselves. It cannot be said that we have left off interpreting Scripture, not by what we have found in the

text, but by what we have brought to it; or that we have not arbitrarily assumed double senses, types, allegories, either to avoid difficulties, or to adapt the Old Testament to the New, and, in general, the meaning of Scripture to the opinions of our own time; or that in portions of Scripture, such as the Book of Daniel and the Revelations, we have not run into excesses about numbers, colours, animals, &c., as great as those of Philo in the Book of Genesis; or that we have not argued from separate verses of Scripture detached from their connexion; or that we have not assumed a system where there was no system, and asked for reasons where there were no reasons; or that we have not blended Aristotelian logic or Platonic fancies with the words of our Lord or St. Paul; or that we have not transfigured the characters of Scripture until they have become ideas rather than living persons; or that we have not sought to connect heathen mythology or philosophy, stories of Deucalion, Iphigenia, Bacchus, Orpheus, with the narrative or doctrines of Scripture; or that we have not untruly identified the meaning of Scripture with the theology of our own day; or that we have not misused classical learning in illustration of Scripture; or that we have not substituted rhetorical praises of Scripture for a true apprehension of its meaning.

Instead of analysing in detail any further portions of Philo's works, it will be more convenient to group our extracts around these subjects, or leading ideas, which Philo and the New Testament have in common. We must here guard the reader against supposing that Philo and St. Paul or St. John are more like than is really the case, owing to the accident of all the resemblances being collected together in a short space. Surprising as these coincidences are, they are, in the writings of Philo, scattered through many volumes amidst endless platitudes. Nor can we be sure that Philo himself would have recognised or acknowledged the connected system which (with the assistance of Gfrörer) has here been collected from his works.

§ I.

The centre of the Alexandrian philosophy, and our interest in it as connected with the New Testament, is the doctrine of the *Λόγος*

(Word). This, however, so immediately flows from the prior doctrine of the nature and being of God, that to understand the former, we must begin with the latter.

In different parts of the Old Testament there are great differences in the manner of God's revelation of Himself. In the earlier portions He is described as walking in the garden in the cool of the day, as talking to Abraham, as wrestling with Jacob, as appearing to Moses in the burning bush, or to Moses and the elders on Mount Sinai: but we should be far from expecting similar appearances in the days of David or of Hezekiah. More and more, in the course of Jewish history, God had been to the Israelites a God hiding Himself, as of old, in the pillar of the cloud, or in the recesses of the most holy place, so in later times seen or spoken with only by His prophets, through whom the divine will was communicated to His people. A religious feeling attached itself to the temple, breaking out in acts of rude violence at the very suspicion of its profanation; and yet this was not inconsistent with the conviction which had more and more wrought itself into the mind of the people, that "God dwelt not in temples made with hands." "Behold, even the heaven and the heaven of heavens cannot contain Him." In whatever manner it was to be reconciled with the earlier history of the Jewish people, the truth "that no man had seen God at any time" was not first taught by the Gospel.

There was another circumstance which indirectly tended to remove God further from the view of the Israelites. The glory of Israel had departed,—the Lord Jehovah no longer went forth with their armies. He was known of then in wrath rather than in mercy. Was He then the author of the evils of their race? The Platonist of Alexandria would not think this. God was not the author of evil, for He was good. How then did evil arise? It seemed to remove evil from Him to suppose that it was executed by His inferior ministers. "He sent evil angels among them." Thus was God, whose presence in the world had once been its life and light, more and more removed from it, that He might be free even from the shadow of a suspicion of evil.

But it was the Greek philosophy, even more than the altered

national belief, or the change in the circumstances of the people, that contributed to give Philo his peculiar view of the Divine nature. While he still retains the old Hebrew titles of King of kings and Lord of lords, he adds others which remind us of Aristotle and Plato. God is the τὸ ὄν—νοητὴ φύσις, ὁ νοῦς τῶν ὄντων; the *summum genus* (γενικώτατον), the efficient cause, the unit, better than wisdom itself, or good itself. Even his figures of speech are often borrowed from Plato. God, he says, is Almighty, as the driver of the chariot, the pilot of the ship; over souls, and bodies, and thoughts, and words, and angels, and earth, and air, and heaven, and things seen, and powers unseen, the Ruler of all things, the Father of the world. He is omnipotent and omniscient, εἷς καὶ τὸ πᾶν, ἅλλοις ἅπανιν ἀρχὴ τοῦ ποιεῖν.

But the leading idea which, more than any other, seems to have taken possession of the mind of Philo and his contemporaries is, that the Divine Being is incomprehensible and invisible. There is nothing which he repeats so often as this; nothing for the sake of which he is so ready to pervert the meaning of Scripture. As the Eleatic philosopher of being, so of God, Philo will admit of no predicates; for which reason he says even ἐγὼ εἶμι ὁ θεὸς σός (*I am the Lord thy God*) is an incorrect expression. (i. 582.) To the prophets and Moses he supposed the true nature of God to be equally unintelligible as to himself. In the same way that the Platonist doctrine of the *ιδέαι* involves a chasm between *φαινόμενα* and *ὄντα* (χωριστὰ τὰ εἶδη), so did the Neoplatonist conception of the Divinity which was the embodiment of those *ιδέαι* absolutely withdraw and separate Him from the world. Or as Philo said, in Aristotelian phrase, τὸ ὄν ἧ ὄν οὐχὶ τῶν πρὸς τι. (i. 582.)

Such doctrines, whether in religion or philosophy, can never be consistently carried out. If we have no knowledge of things in themselves, it is vain to repeat that there are things in themselves; if we have no knowledge of the Divine nature, it is useless to tell us that there is a God. Hence, in all ages, philosophy, and yet more religion, have availed themselves of the inconsistency in the human mind which allows men to believe truths not wholly reconcilable with each other. The mode of concealing the discrepancy, in the present

case, was as follows:— In His true nature God is incomprehensible, and yet there is a certain sense also in which He is cognisable by contemplation and by the observation of His works. (i. 107.) The latter is the lower way, which extracts a knowledge of God from the sight of trees and flowers, sun and stars; the other is the higher way of intellectual communion or divine imagination, as it may be termed (*Θεὸν θεῶ φαντασιῶσαι*), imparted by God Himself, who, when we contemplate Him, is contemplating Himself in us. (ii. 415.) This higher knowledge of God is the knowledge of a pure unity, as of a form without shadow, such as the sun sheds upon the earth at mid-day. Thus, even in this sort of knowledge, little is known of the Divine Being but that He exists.

The same difficulty met Philo and the Alexandrians from what may be termed the objective side, in representing the relation of God to the world. If God is absolutely separate from the world, how does He act upon it? To answer this difficulty Philo introduces the fiction of *δυνάμεις*. These may be described in the words of the poet as the

“Thrones, dominations, principedoms, virtues, powers,”

whereby, as in some Asiatic court, the King of kings is surrounded, his *ὀπαδοὶ*, *δορυφόροι*, *ὑπηρέται*, &c. They are efficient causes, the bands of the world; sometimes appearing as persons, as in the visit of the angels to Abraham; also the ideas and *summa genera* of things, as well as the powers by which they are created. The highest of them are called *δυνάμεις χαριστικαὶ* and *κολαστικαὶ*; or, in another passage, *ποιητικαὶ* and *βασιλικάι*; others are the *δυνάμεις προνοητικῇ, νομοθετικῇ, ἰλέως*. (i. 431. 560.; ii. 150.)

These *δυνάμεις* occupy the same place in Philo's system, as the doctrine of emanations in the Oriental philosophy. They are designed to place God further from the world, and yet to connect Him with it. We ourselves, so far as we attribute any substance or reality to God's general laws apart from Himself, have recourse to a similar figure. These *δυνάμεις* may be said to wear a double face; one looking toward the Greek philosophy, and the other to the Old Testament Scriptures. In the first aspect they are but a new name for the Platonic *ἰδέαι*

(ii. 261.), while they themselves serve as intermediate links, now that the chasm to be bridged is thrown further back and placed not between the *ἰδέαι* and phenomena, but between God and the world. In another point of view they are the *ἄγγελοι* of the Old Testament; the beings who appeared to Abraham and Lot, themselves persons, and yet modes of Divine existence. Philo's own statement respecting them is, that to spirits they are spirits, but angels or men to men. (i. 655.) They might be described in the language of the Old Testament as the angels of the Divine presence. They abide in the Word. (i. 4.)

When God has been so far removed from the sphere of human intelligence, it may seem absurd to dwell on his moral nature. Yet Philo, forgetful of his transcendentalism, returns again and again in praise and thanksgiving to the natural instincts of the heart. "His goodness and gentle power is the harmony of all things." (ii. 155.) "To whom," he says, "shall we give thanks but to God," and by what means but through the things that we have received?" "In making rain to fall upon the earth, what does He but make manifest the riches of His goodness?" It is on this side of the Divine nature that Philo delights to dwell. "Good," he says, "comes directly from Him, but evil only indirectly." "Not only does He judge first and show mercy afterwards, but He shows mercy first and judges afterwards: for with Him mercy is older than justice." "The fullness of His power He never exerts towards any creature." So again with an antithesis of the prepositions which reminds us of some passages in St. Paul's writings as well as of Aristotle, he says, there are two ways in which God works. Some things are only *ἐκ' αὐτοῦ* (by Him); others are *ἐκ' αὐτοῦ*, and *δι' αὐτοῦ* (by Him and through Him) as well. (i. 51.) Of the former sort is evil, of the latter good; an idea nearly answering to the modern expression, God is the Author of good, but the Permitter of evil.

Three texts of Scripture will sum up the main peculiarities of Philo's view of the nature of the Divine Being. First, "No man hath seen God at any time;" the thought of his age and nation seeking to harmonise the reverence for the Lord Jehovah with the Greek philosophy, which, however, Philo carries out consistently to the con-

sequence that no man hath seen or known, or can conceive or tell anything of God; and then falls into the extreme inconsistency of making Him the subject of human feelings and emotions. Secondly, "the pure in heart see God;" not, however, in the sense of our Saviour in the Sermon on the Mount; for the purity spoken of is not a moral, but rather a mystic purity, such as was exclusively possessed by contemplative sects like the Essenes and Therapeutæ. Thirdly, "God cannot be tempted of evil, neither tempteth He any man." To execute evil, therefore, He employs inferior ministers, such as the angels, just as to make Himself known to man at all, He employs the agency of the λόγος.*

§ 2.

The λόγος has been already spoken of as the centre of the Alexandrian theology. The necessity which led to its introduction may be gathered from the previous section. Man had removed God so far from the world, that there seemed to be no God,—nothing to which the human heart could turn, or on which human thought could dwell. The chasm was bridged, the system of the world harmonised, the human soul and understanding united with God by the λόγος.

Aristotle raises a question which he does not profess to answer: "Which of the Platonic ideas connected the rest of the ideas with sensible things?" There was a parallel question in the Alexandrian theology, which, although it had far outgrown this, and become, to use a modern expression, the great question of that day, may yet be traced up to a similar dialectical difficulty: "What has man to do with God, or God with the world?" To this question the λόγος supplied the answer.

It is true, though wearisome to repeat, yet a thought that should be vividly present to us at every step of this inquiry, that the age

* I have to acknowledge again that the materials of this and the following sections are in a great measure derived from Gfrörer, and many of the reflections indirectly suggested by him.

of which we are speaking was an age of ideas; an age not balanced by experience, or steadied by practical life; an age as completely overpowered and mastered by abstractions as earlier centuries had been by nature or by mythology. The form had changed; but the one was as much a fiction as the other. The Alexandrian age differs from the mythical not in its critical spirit, which was the spirit of verbal criticism only, but in its higher conception of morality, its nearer approach to the true idea of God and revelation and its renunciation of the sensible world. It was mythical and not mythical, poetical and rhetorical at once. Its imagery may be compared to a cast of some soft material, capable of being worked into any form by the hand. It might be described as a colourless mythology.

Ages which are under the power of ideas are also under the power of words. Like the names of the gods in mythology, words played a great part in the Alexandrian system. The Greek philosophy supplied the conception of a Divine *νοῦς*; but what was still more important, the Greek language supplied the word *λόγος* with its happy ambiguity of reason and speech, "outward and inward word" itself a mediator between two worlds. The Alexandrian recognised as readily as a modern German philosopher, that thought and language were but two aspects of the same thing. How natural an expression was this of the relation between the outward and visible and the inward and spiritual, to men who had not either the consciousness of fixed laws of nature or the strong sense of human individuality like ourselves!

The extreme readiness with which ideas, such as *λόγος*, *σοφία*, *πνεῦμα*, were transmuted into persons, is of itself a further reflection of a mythological age. The Greek in Homer's time personified fire, water, and the other elements; and in a doubtful and wavering manner, which may be termed half-personification, sought to embody also abstract ideas, such as strife, fear, and love. The Greek under the Ptolemies personified *νοῦς*, *λόγος*, *πνεῦμα*. In this latter process there were many stages and transitions. It was a sort of inversion of the mythological one, passing not from realities to figures of speech, but from figures of speech to realities. Gradually the abstract term began to stand out, helped by the fortunate accident of a word,

and, in the case of the λόγος, by its identification with the vision of God in the Pentateuch.

The earliest form of the λόγος (word) is the ἄγγελος or εἰκὼν Θεοῦ, such as was immediately suggested by the language of the Old Testament. Another source of the same thought is the conception of wisdom in the Book of Proverbs, which in Ecclesiasticus is just ceasing to be a figure of speech, and becoming a reality; it was retained in the later Alexandrianism as a sort of feminine λόγος. But the original notion in either of its two forms, whether the more concrete and allied to sense, or more abstract and ideal, was soon overlaid by the notions of Greek philosophy, which quickly resolved them into each other. Thus the ἄγγελος became a λόγος, and the λόγοι in turn became ἄγγελοι. The associations of either were endless; many were supplied by the word itself, still more by Plato and Aristotle; while every passage in the Old Testament in which mention occurred of any type or figure which could by any possibility be connected with it, was transferred to the λόγος.

First came the great distinction of Philo between λόγος ἐνδιάθετος and λόγος προφορικός (ii. 154.), which is a metaphor taken from the relation between human thought and language. As the thought of a man is to the speech of a man, so is the λόγος ἐνδιάθετος to the λόγος προφορικός. Either element of the doctrine derived support from the Old Testament, or from the Greek philosophy indifferently. This, however, is not the only play of words which Philo bases on the different significations of the word λόγος. Thus λόγος is used for νόμος, the law=the Word of God; εἴ τις ποιῇ τὸν νόμον, ποιῇ καὶ τὸν λόγον. Another meaning of λόγος assists that philosophy of number which Philo every where introduces; in the sense of ratio of numbers the word λόγος bears an important part in the κόσμος. As the Eleatic philosopher, wherever the words ὄν, ἐστίν, εἶναι, occurred seemed to see a confirmation of his favourite theory; so the Alexandrian, whatever might be the sense in which the word λόγος was employed, eagerly adapted it to his purpose, and caught the evidence of the universality of the idea in the ever recurring use of the word! Or, to look nearer home for an illustration, as commentators on the Old Testament, wherever they found the word spirit, have identified it with the

third person of the Trinity; or as the early Fathers, in the accidental mention of bread and wine in the prophets, saw a type and figure of the Eucharist.

The second class of associations derived from Plato and the Greek philosophy so often blend with those of the Old Testament, as to make it difficult to separate them. In a few only the genuine language of Plato is retained. Thus, the λόγος is *ιδέα ιδεῶν, εἶδος εἰδῶν*, the habitation of the *ιδέαι*, in which they seem to reside. So, again, according to that explanation of the *ιδέαι* which made them *γένη*, the λόγος is said to be *γενικώτατον*, the *summum genus* which comprehended all things in itself. In like manner the λόγος is also termed *τομεύς*, that is, the divider of the genus into its species. Here, however, a secondary thought enters in, which gives a curious insight into the network by which the Old Testament and Plato are woven together; the λόγος is not only the divider of the genus into its species, but of the sacrifice into its parts. (i. 491.) In the New Testament similar language occurs, though in a different sense; the word of God is quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword (*τομώτερος ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν μάχαιραν*).

As Plato divided the world into *νοητά* and *αἰσθητά*, Philo makes a corresponding division of the λόγος. It is not quite clear whether he designed this to be the same with the one above mentioned of the λόγος *ἐνδιάθετος* and *προφορικός*. Probably he had never distinctly inquired of himself whether they were the same or different manifestations. Where language is so much the soul of philosophy, we can scarcely suppose a variation of the word without a change of the idea; if indeed it be not the truer view that the word is the idea. In the present instance, the difference of expression seems of itself to suggest a difference of meaning; the λόγος *ἐνδιάθετος* and *προφορικός* being supposed to stand in the same relation to each other as human speech and human thought, the soul and body of thought; while the λόγος *νοητός* and *αἰσθητός* is but an adaptation of the Platonic distinction.

A curious blending of Greek philosophy and of Jewish and Christian notions occurs in his account of the λόγος *μεσίτης*. All things, says Philo, are in pairs, right and left, good and evil, Israel

and the Egyptian hosts; and between these two the λόγος stands as a mean, neither begotten as man, nor unbegotten as God; standing by God as the pledge that the whole race will not utterly rebel, and by man that he may have a good hope that God will not overlook the work of His hands. Have we not here the Pythagorean *συστοιχία*, the Aristotelian doctrine of a mean, and the Mediator of the New Testament, jumbled together in one?

But as Philo and the Alexandrians remained within the circle of the Old Testament as the authoritative source of their teaching, it is from the book of the law we should naturally expect to find their doctrine of the λόγος receive its chief development. What is Greek and what is Jewish in origin it is not always possible to determine. But in general it may be said that, while the idea itself, like the word, is plainly Greek, nearly all the attributes and figures of it are taken from the Jewish Scriptures. Persons, places, things, relations human and divine, are all transferred to it. Hence, we must not be surprised to find a λόγος within a λόγος in this plastic theology; there is no conceivable relation in which the λόγος does not stand to God and man; no figure of speech which is not embodied in him. It is sometimes within man, at other times without man; sometimes divine, at other times human; it is also that in which the human soul is said to exist; Moses and the angel of His presence, the priest and the sacrifice, the temple and a Greater than the temple, all in one.

A sort of transition is formed from the Alexandrian to the Jewish aspect of the λόγος by the idea of νόμος; another ambiguous term, at which the fancy caught, which was common to the Greek and Jewish world. As the λόγος is the first emanation and energy of the Divine Being, whereby the world was created, so also it is the law or bond of the world, ἀπὸ τῶν μέσων ἐπὶ τὰ πέρατα συνάγων τὰ μέρη πάντα καὶ σφίγγων. In all the workings of God in nature the λόγος is the intermediate link. Neither is it only the law of the physical, but of the political world, and orders the changes of states. In the spirit of Sulpicius' letter to Cicero, Philo says, "Look at Pontus, Macedonia, Carthage; their vicissitudes are not chance, but Providence. The

Θεῖος λόγος is ever running about the world to establish the perfect form of government—universal democracy. Νόμος, equally with λόγος, had become a power, almost a person; a conception of both, which naturally led to their identification with each other. Thus Philo says, in a passage which at once reminds us of Plato and of St. Paul: "Every bad man is a slave," ὅσοι μετὰ νόμου ζῶσιν ἐλεύθεροι. Νόμος δὲ ἀψευδὴς ὁ ὀρθὸς λόγος, οὐχ ὑπὸ τοῦ δεινός ἢ τοῦ δεινός θνητοῦ φθαρτὸς ἐν χαρτιδίῳ ἢ στήλαις ἄψυχος ἀψύχοις, ἀλλ' ὑπ' ἀθανάτου φύσεως ἀφθαρτος ἐν ἀθανάτῳ διανοία τυπωθεὶς. (ii. 452.) Do we not trace here the beginning of that wider and more expansive notion of the law which we find in the Epistles; a law above a law, not written on tables of stone, such as those had who, not having the law, were a law unto themselves?

A still more remarkable parallel with St. Paul is found in Philo's explanation of the law of Leviticus, xvi. 36., according to which the house was not pronounced unclean until seen by the high priest. Philo, after his usual manner of setting aside the text where its meaning seems inappropriate, says, that the literal interpretation of this cannot be accepted: for the priest's coming to the house would make it clean and not unclean. Here, therefore, as elsewhere, the priest is the λόγος, and the meaning is, that before the λόγος enters into the soul it is innocent in all things: ἔως ὃ θεῖος λόγος εἰς τὴν ψυχὴν ἡμῶν καθάπερ τινὰ ἐστίαν οὐκ ἀφίκεται πάντα αὐτῆς τὰ ἔργα ἀνυπαίτια. (i. 292—299.)

We have here a sort of parody of St. Paul's often repeated thought, "Sin is not imputed where there is no law;" "I was alive without the law once;" "the law entered in that sin might abound." But the parallel is carried yet further. For as in many passages of Scripture we have the law spoken of with scarcely any reference to the Mosaic law for the workings of the human soul under the sense of sin, or, as we should say, for the conscience, Philo has also his λόγος ἑλεγχος ὁ ἐκάστη ψυχῇ συνοικῶν καὶ συμπεφυκῶς ἑλεγχος· κατήγορος ὁμοῦ καὶ δικαστὴς ὁ αὐτὸς ὢν. (ii. 195.) When convicted by our own conscience, he says we should pray God to save us by chastisement, and send His λόγος ἑλεγχος into our minds. So the angel who appears to Balaam is the type of the ἑλεγχος attacking the soul disposed to sin. This

ἐλεγχος is also the παράκλητος, the comforter and instructor as well. (ii. 247.)

The parallels with the New Testament are not yet exhausted. For example, the λόγος is the living stream, the river of God in Paradise, the bread that came down from heaven, the garden of Eden itself, the sword that turned every way. It is, however, in the personifications of the λόγος that the most striking parallelisms are found; the word seeming to draw to itself, by a sort of natural attraction, all the passages in which manifestations of angels, or of the Divine presence occur in the Old Testament.

Our own idea of personality does not admit of degrees. To us it is not natural to think of either man or angel as more or less a person, Nor, again, is it easy to imagine, except in poetry, an outward form of personality, such as is assigned to the Homeric heroes in the world below. Still less, perhaps, is it natural to us to conceive two persons in one. Such distinct ideas of personality, did not, however, exist for the age of which we are speaking. In the same manner that any one deity in the heathen pantheon might have many statues and images of him, without thereby implying the notion that these statues were mere representations of him, in the same way that by some anomaly of the human mind saints are worshipped in many places at once with hardly a thought of attributing omnipresence or even pluripresence to them; so to the Alexandrian in Philo's time the λόγος might be many persons, and exist in many persons, and have many shadows and images of himself without thereby losing his original personality. On this view only can Philo be made intelligible. When we raise the question whether the λόγος was a person, it must be admitted that the word person has a distinctness and unity which belongs not to that age, but to a subsequent one, and is therefore used in a somewhat different sense from that in which we ordinarily employ it.

An earlier form of the λόγος, as has been already mentioned, is the σοφία of the book of Ecclesiasticus. Wisdom and the Word of God are there described as real powers, almost as persons. It has been doubted, however, whether we are to look here for the personality of the λόγος. Gfrörer is of opinion that the personal notion of the λόγος is originally Jewish, and that the Platonism was an after

addition. In the absence of much positive evidence, the following seems to me the most probable conjecture on this subject.

It can scarcely be doubted that to the Jew every where, whether at Alexandria or in Palestine, the aspect of the religion of his fathers had much changed. To neither could the law in its original meaning have been wholly intelligible. To both probably, whether under the influence of Egypt or of Chaldea, the visible appearance of God in the altered state of the world seemed strange and discordant. That this was the case appears to be proved by the observation of Gfrörer, that eight out of twelve passages in the translation of the LXX, where such appearances occur, have been altered by the translator. Both, therefore, the Jew of Alexandria and of Palestine alike, might be said to be prepared for the doctrine of the λόγος, that is, to feel the need of an intermediate being, who might take the place of the God who had guided his people Israel. The Alexandrian coming more immediately under the influence of the Greek philosophy, sought and found it in the Platonic νοῦς; while the Jew, confining himself to the Hebrew Scriptures, exalted the angels into the place of mediators, and found in the law the answer to his own difficulty. The λόγος itself implied the idea of personality, so far as this can be separated from individual form and character, while on the other hand it derived a kind of outward figure or embodiment from the angels, or the patriarchs, or the high priest. From these latter it gained a new personality, while it was itself the pantheistic link by which they were connected together, εἷς ἐν πᾶσι. And although from the few facts bearing upon the question we are obliged to reason "à priori," there is no reason, notwithstanding the absence of positive evidence, to doubt that the idea of personality was partly supplied by both; so far as it is involved in the idea of mind, by the Alexandrian philosophy; so far as it seems to connect the idea of an outward form or embodiment, by the Old Testament itself. The λόγος may have been identified with the angel of his presence, or the angel of his presence identified with the λόγος; the conception of Philo implies both.

There is scarcely an angelic or divine appearance in the law which Philo does not attribute to the λόγος. He is the beginning and Creator of the world, the angel who appeared to Hagar, the avenging angel

who destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah, the God who appeared to Jacob in Gen. xxviii. 11. 19., the Divine form who changed the name of Jacob to Israel, the angel of the Lord in the burning bush, the cloud at the Red Sea, the angel who appeared to Balaam, the guide of the Israelites in the wilderness, the guide of Abraham. Individuals are also types of him. Melchizedek is "the reason" to which we offer the first fruits; Aaron and Moses are also symbols of the λόγος; Bezaleel is a τρόπος ψυχῆς, who makes the shadows of things even as Moses makes the realities; the sons of Jacob are one man's sons, ἓνα πάτερα ἐπιγεγραμμένοι, that is, the ἄνθρωπος Θεοῦ, the λόγος. Both these last passages may be illustrated by another passage in Philo's account of the creation, in which he says that God made the image first,—a seal, an idea, a genus, immortal, without sex; afterwards he made the species Adam (διττὰ ἀνθρώπων γένη • ὁ μὲν γάρ ἐστιν οὐράνιος ἄνθρωπος, ὁ δὲ γήϊνος).

The Platonic image of the copy and the reality is constantly recurring in Philo; that of the ἄνθρωπος Θεοῦ is more important for the purpose of our present inquiry. (i. 411.) In some sense the λόγος is man as well as God, the ideal man. There are two temples, says Philo, the first the world, of which the λόγος is the high priest; the second, the rational soul, of which the high priest is the true man. So the λόγος is said to be the προτόγονος υἱὸς Θεοῦ, as the world is the second son. He is neither begotten as man, nor unbegotten as God, which is the very attribute that enables him to mediate between God and man. Words which imply human virtue are applied to him, such as would never be applied to God. He is the ἐκέτης in Moses, who intercedes for the people; the παράκλητος, who is with the high priest when he goes in to intercede for the people; the ἱερὸς λόγος, who, in Num. xvi. 48., stands between the living and the dead; the cloud that divided the Egyptians and Israelites; above all, the ἀρχιερεὺς (i. 270. 562.), who mediates between God and man; who is not to be defiled by touching the corpse of his father, *i. e.* the Spirit; or his mother, *i. e.* the sense; who is married to a virgin, even the pure sense, and wears for his priestly garment the world and the elements.

Two accessory ideas remain to be considered, σοφία and πνεῦμα. The first is in most respects identical with λόγος. Like the λόγος, it

is the creative power and inner principle of the soul, and has the same predicates attributed to it. The chief differences in its use arise from its feminine termination, which renders its employment more appropriate where a feminine, such as *πήγη, μητήρ, θυγάτηρ*, is the symbol under which it is expressed. As *σοφία* occurs less frequently than *λόγος*, it is not so completely personified; always retaining in some degree the nature of an abstract term, for which reason it is in some passages opposed to *λόγος*, as inward to outward. One place in which Philo uses it for the rock in the wilderness, as elsewhere for the manna, affords a remarkable parallel to St. Paul; *ἡ ἀκρότομος πέτρα ἡ σοφία τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐστὶν ἣν ἄκραν καὶ πρωτίστην ἔτεμεν ὁ Θεὸς ἀπὸ τῶν ἑαυτοῦ δυνάμεων.*

The other modification of the *λόγος* is the *πνεῦμα*, on the double meaning of which latter Philo himself remarks. Altogether it has four principal uses: (1.) The wind; (2.) The idea of the soul; (3.) The wisdom that is from above; (4.) Prophetic power. It is a synonym of *λόγος*, except so far as the word itself suggests different associations. Thus it is used more naturally wherever the communion of men with one another, or with God, or the inspiration of man, is spoken of. So Philo says that the Spirit cannot endure among divisions; and those who are under its influence are borne upward as by a wind, and hence are said to be *ἀνακαλούμενοι*.

At this point we may pause to consider the parallelisms between Philo and the New Testament, which have already presented themselves:—

1. The invisibility of God.—John i. 18.
2. The ministration of angels in giving the law.—Gal. iii.
3. The "word," as prefigured by the manna.
 - as the living stream.
 - as a sword (*τομεύς*).
 - as the image of God.
 - as the high priest.
 - as the cloud at the Red Sea.
 - (under the name *σοφία*) as the rock in the wilderness.
 - as the first begotten Son of God.

as begotten before the world, which is God's
 second Son (πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως).
 as the man of God.
 as the Paraclete and Intercessor.
 as the Mediator.
 as Melchizedek.
 as the Messiah.
 as like the νόμος in St. Paul's Epistles, under the
 title of ἔλεγχος, the convincer of sin.
 as the οὐράνιος ἄνθρωπος, who is opposed to the
 χοϊκός.

These parallelisms between Philo and the New Testament have different degrees of resemblance. Thus, for example, the idea of the λόγος as the Messiah is but faintly indicated in Philo; that of the λόγος as μεσίτης is mixed up, as we have seen, with Pythagorean follies; that "of the οὐράνιος and χοϊκὸς ἄνθρωπος" is not exactly the same with St. Paul's first and second Adam. But whatever may be the difference in their meaning, the fact that such expressions exist alike in two writings separated from each other by an interval of twenty or thirty years cannot be attributed to accident; while, on the other hand, neither of the two present the slightest trace of having borrowed from the other. The only supposition that remains is, that they belonged to the mode of thinking of the age, whatever inflections or adaptations of meaning they may have received.

§ 3.

Philo's conception of the creation is very different from that which we gather from the Old Testament. The world, he says, is not without beginning; but his idea of γένεσις is the working of God upon matter which pre-existed. Creation is with him rather the ordering and arrangement of the world than the actual bringing of it into being. Yet he, too, uses the same expression as St. Paul (τὰ μὴ ὄντα εἰς τὸ εἶναι καλεῖν, ii. 367.), to call the things that are not into being, though in a different sense. There was no subject in which

Greek and Oriental modes of thought so naturally, almost necessarily, came into conflict with Jewish, as in the conception of the creation: Philo felt the difficulty, and sought to remove it by Pythagorean triads of numbers, which, however strange it may seem, were much more agreeable and intelligible to that degenerate age than the simple sublimity of the Mosaic narrative.

The world he conceives of as perfect, the work of God, having an order, harmony, and sympathy running through it, a plurality in unity, full of pairs; therein all things have need of one another, and love one another. It is the temple of God, not built for the sake of man, but man a part of it; the great city of which all men are citizens. To deny this excellence of creation were impiety. So far is Philo from St. Paul's view, that "the whole creation is groaning and travailing together until now." Creation he regards as a *γένεσις* towards an end which is necessarily good. The vastness of the thought in the Old Testament is overlaid by his Greek education, and reduced to Aristotelian rule and precision. It is moreover idealised. In many passages of Philo we almost seem to trace the thought of a living philosopher. "The world is a petrified intelligence."

The heavens he sometimes conceives as one with the earth; at other times as distinct from it. The air is a sort of heaven; it is the habitation of incorporeal souls. The stars are pure souls incapable of evil, heavenly powers which guide and foretell human events on earth. Everywhere between earth and highest heaven, which is beyond the moon, there are ethereal beings; some standing around the throne of God, others coming down to earth to do his bidding; some unseen, others from love to mankind taking human bodies. They are described as *λόγοι*, as the mediators between God and man, as angels, as human beings exalted from earth to heaven, as ministering spirits who give to drink of the water of life. Those of them who are spoken of as the sons of God in Genesis, he considers to have been men who became angels, and returned to their human condition.

He holds the Platonic doctrine of the pre-existence of the human soul, though he arrives at it in a different way. Every wise man, he says, regards the heavens as his native land, the earth as a strange

country. Like the λόγος, man is an ἀπόσπασμα or ἀπαύγασμα θεῖον, or, to speak more religiously, ὅπερ ὁσιώτερον εἰπεῖν τοῖς κατὰ Μωϋσῆν φιλοσοφοῦσιν εἰκόνας θείας ἐκμαγεῖον ἐμφερές. Sometimes he represents the ether as the source of the human soul; and in other passages λόγοι, or ideas bearing the image of God, and the stamp of the Divine Spirit. This participation in the Divine Spirit makes man free, and therefore capable of virtue, without which freedom is impossible.

It is not a matter of surprise that Philo's psychology should be inconsistent with itself, or that he should make an ineffectual attempt to unite two psychological systems. The soul, he says, in its pre-existent state, is a μονάς, and becomes a δυνάς by the addition of the body. It is also called τριμερής, and made to consist of three parts, ἐπιθυμία, θυμός, νοῦς; or, according to another division, of αἰσθησις, λόγος, νοῦς. In this last passage it may be observed that λόγος stands for speech, which is the house of the mind, as the λόγος is the house of God. (ii. 350. 243.) A further Pythagorean fancy leads him, while maintaining the unity of the rational soul, to divide the irrational into seven parts, answering to the seven senses—sight, taste, touch, hearing, smelling, generation, and speech. The perfect number seven, as he delights to remark, according to which the world was created, comes down to us.

But besides these Greek modes of thought, there is also another point of view, purely Jewish, in which Philo regards the soul as opposed to the body. The body is the source of evil; the Egyptian house, in which, as in a living tomb, the soul is forced to dwell: δεδεμένη σώματι φθαρτῷ, ἐντετυμβενμένη, νεκροφοροῦσα. In vain does Divine wisdom take up its abode in the body: διὰ δὲ τὸ εἶναι αὐτοὺς σάρκας οὐ καταμένει. Marriage, and the education of children, and the provision for daily life, and meanness, and avarice, and occupation wither wisdom ere it can come into bloom. Yet does nothing so impede its growth as the fleshly nature. This is the foundation of ignorance and want of understanding on which the others are built. In the language almost of the New Testament, he describes the life of the bad as τὰ φιλα τῇ σαρκὶ ἐργάζεσθαι καὶ μεθοδεύειν. There is an original sin in the flesh, and in man as a created being, against which

the Spirit of God is ever striving. There is a strife in the camp, says Moses; that is, the Spirit within us cries out. Not that the bodily substance of the flesh is to be regarded as the source of evil, but the flesh comprehends in itself the ideal evil will, ever seeking to satisfy the lusts of the flesh.

Hence Philo is led to make a new division of the soul into two parts: the one in alliance with the flesh, the other separate from it. There are two kinds of men, he says — those who live in the flesh, and those who live in the Spirit. And there is an outer soul, *ψυχὴ σαρκική*, the essence of which is blood, corresponding to the first of these two classes, and an inner soul, *ψυχὴ λογική*, which answers to the latter, into which God puts His Spirit. That is the true soul; the soul of souls, as it were — the apple of the eye. (ii. 241. 356.) In like manner he seems disposed to confine immortality to the souls of the good.

The chief parallels with the Epistles which occur in the preceding section, may be summed up as follows:—

The idea of Creation, *τὰ μὴ ὄντα εἰς τὸ εἶναι καλεῖν*.

His conception of the human soul as an *ἀπαύγασμα θεῖον, εἰκονος θείας ἐκμαγεῖον ἐμφερές*. (i. 208.)

The body, as the tomb of the soul, which is said to be *ἐντετυμ-βευμένη, νεκροφοροῦσα*. (ii. 367. 387.)

The strife of the soul and the body.

The flesh conceived of as the seat of sin.

The ideal soul inspired by God.

The innumerable company of angels and aerial beings.

The distinction of the *ψυχὴ σαρκική* and *λογική*, taken from the good and bad man, like St. Paul's *φρόνημα σαρκός* and *φρόνημα πνεύματος*.

§ 4.

The end of human life, according to Philo, is to follow God, and become like Him, and the mean to this is virtue. Philo, however, sometimes proposes the mean, without reference to God, as in itself the end. It is the seed which is also the fruit. It consists in bringing *αἰσθητὰ* under *νοητὰ*, and is the same with wisdom.

But how is man to attain to virtue? He is corrupt, and may justly be punished by God. Philo's answer is the same as that of the New Testament. God gives men grace to enable them to serve Him. He alludes to the passage in which it is said that Noah found grace in the sight of God. It was of God's giving, not of his deserving.

That so inconsistent a writer as Philo should have seen any necessity for carrying out views in which theology is seldom perfectly consistent with itself, was not to be expected. Accordingly he superadds to his theological theory the ethics of Greek philosophy. There are three ways upwards, διδαχή, φύσις, ἄσκησις, of which he finds types in the three patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Of these the lowest is the way of ἄσκησις; he who practises this is described as in a perpetual state of strife and struggle, the image of which is Jacob on his pillow of stones, of which also the Homeric heroes are a figure, as described in the line ἀλλότῃ μὲν ζῶουσ' ἑτερήμεροι ἀλλότῃ δ' αὐτὲ τεθνῶσιν. Next to him stands the διδασκός, of whom Abraham is the type; and yet, strange to say, the διδαχή consists in nothing but the ordinary elements of Greek education; viz.:—grammar, music, geometry, rhetoric, and dialectic. Before Sarah, who, according to Philo's allegorical method, is virtue, can bear a son to Abraham, who is the representative of νοῦς, he must betake himself to Hagar, that is, the slavery of knowledge. The soul must have its food of milk and plain sustenance first, afterwards its strong meat; *ρηπίδις ἐστὶ γάλα τροφή, τελείους δὲ τὰ ἐκ πύρων πέμματα.* (i. 302.) So near a parallel to St. Paul as this image affords, which occurs three or four times in Philo, is not supplied by the whole writings of Plato.

But the highest way is the way of nature, of which Isaac is the type. Here nothing but the word φύσις affords a vestige of the Greek philosopher. The way of nature is the way of God, attained only by withdrawing from the flesh. Allowing for the difference between St. Paul's point of view and Philo's, it might be described almost in the language which St. Paul applies to the "wisdom that is from above." First, it is peaceable, and is accompanied by a joy which God communicates from His own attributes—the joy of resignation, which looks with pleasure on the whole world. Secondly,

it is pure, and reveals the sight of God to the pure in heart: *ιδεῖν οὐκ ἄδύνατον, εἴη δ' ἂν μόνῳ τῷ καθαρσιότητι καὶ ὀξυωπεσιότητι γένοι, ᾧ τὰ ἴδια ἐπιδεικνύμενος ὁ τῶν ὅλων πατήρ ἔργα, μεγίστην πασῶν χαρίζεται δωρεάν.* (Compare John, v. 20.) He who has it, becomes a steward of the mysteries of God, *μυστῆς τῶν Θεῶν τελετῶν.* (ii. 427.) (Compare St. Paul, *οἰκόνομος τῶν Θεῶν μυστηρίων.*) Lastly, it consists in the contemplation of God, *ὥσπερ διὰ κατόπτρου* (ii. 198.), an image which occurs again and again in Philo, and is repeated more than once in St. Paul — “For now we see through a glass darkly, but then face to face.”

Many other striking parallels with the description of the Christian life occur in Philo. Such are the expressions — *διψᾶν καὶ πεινᾶν καλοκάγαθίας, διψᾶν ἐννομίας, δουλεῖν θεῷ, ἐναρεστεῖν θεῷ, γνωρίζεσθαι θεῷ*, by which Philo denotes the relation of the perfect man to God. Another mode of expression with which he is familiar, is that of the “true riches,” — *οἷς ἀληθινὸς πλοῦτος ἐν οὐρανῷ κατακείται διὰ σοφίας καὶ ὁσιότητος ἀσκηθεὶς τούτοις καὶ ὁ τῶν χρημάτων ἐπὶ γῆς περιουσιάζει, οἷς δὲ ὁ κληρὸς οὐκ ἔστιν οὐράνιος δι' ἀσεβείαν ἢ ἀδικίαν οὐδὲ τῶν ἐπὶ γῆς ἀγαθῶν ἐνδοδεῖν πέφυκεν ἡ κτῆσις.* (ii. 425.) “Lay not up for yourselves treasures on earth, and all these things shall be added unto.” A third parallel with our Saviour's sermon on the mount is the use of the figure of the straight and narrow way: *ἄτριπτος ὁ ἀρετῆς χῶρος· ὀλίγοι γὰρ βαίνουσιν αὐτὸν, τέτριπται δ' ὁ κακίας.* (i. 84.)

To the four cardinal virtues of Plato and the Stoics, which he delights to recognise in the four rivers of Paradise and elsewhere, Philo adds what we may term three Christian graces. These are hope, which is the seed and germ of life, of which Enos is the type; repentance, which is prefigured by Enoch, as Gfrörer supposes, *ὅτι μετέθηκεν αὐτὸν ὁ θεός*; righteousness, which is typified by Noah, the last saviour of the ancient evil race, and the preserver of the new. In addition to these, there occurs a second triad of *πίστις*, *χαρά*, and *ἔρασις θεοῦ*, which is yet higher than the preceding, and of which Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are the examples. (ii. 2, 3. 5. 8.)

His conception of faith is as of an unshakeable trust in God. It is that within which says to him in the name of God — “Do thou stand here with me.” It is the adhesive force which binds us to

God: *τίς οὖν ἡ κόλλα; εὐσέβεια δέηπου καὶ πίσις· ἀρμόζουσι γὰρ καὶ ἐνοῦσιν αἱ ἀρεταὶ ἀφθάρτῳ φύσει διανοίαν· καὶ γὰρ Ἀβραάμ πιστεύσας ἐγγίζειν θεῷ λέγεται.* In another passage he thus comments on the words — “Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him for righteousness.” What could make his faith so praiseworthy? Has not the evil also faith in God? To which we reply, If you look not at the surface, but at the substance of things, you will know that it is infinitely hard to trust God alone; to loose the bands of ambition, lucre, power, friendship, and other earthly goods; to set thyself wholly free from the creature, and trust to God, who is alone to be trusted — *μόνῳ πιστεῦσαι θεῷ τῷ πρὸς ἀληθείαν μόνῳ πίστῳ.*

The faith of Philo has not the depth or associations of that of St. Paul; it bears a nearer resemblance to faith in the sense of the Epistle to the Hebrews. That is, it is not faith, the negative of the law, faith that makes men free, but the faith of one “who endures as seeing Him who is invisible.” Almost in the language of Heb. xi. he describes Abraham as seeking a better country which God would show him, and finding his reward in regarding the things that are not as though they were: *ἀρτηθεῖσα καὶ κρεμασθεῖσα ἡ διάνοια ἐλπίδος χρηστῆς, καὶ ἀνενδοιάστα νομίσασα ἥδη παρεῖναι τὰ μὴ παρόντα διὰ τὴν τοῦ ὑποσχομένου βεβαιωτάτην πίστιν, ἀγαθὸν τέλειον ἄθλον εὔρηται.* In another passage he describes faith as the only true and living good, the consolation of life, “the substance of good hope:” *πλήρωμα χρηστῶν ἐλπίδων, ἀφορία μὲν κακῶν, ἀγαθῶν δὲ φορὰ, κακοδαιμονίας ἀπόγνωσις, εὐσεβείας γνώσις, ψυχῆς ἐν ἅπασι βελτίωσις ἐπερηρισμένης τῷ τῶν πάντων αἰτίῳ καὶ δυναμένῳ μὲν πάντα, βουλομένῳ δὲ τὰ ἄριστα.* (ii. 39.) “This is the strait and smooth way, in which, if a man walks, he stumbles not, in which he avoids the slippery path of bodily and external things. He who trusts these latter has no faith in God, he who has no faith in these has faith in God.” De Mig. Abrah : De Abrahamo.

In other places the more general term *εὐσέβεια* takes the place of *πίσις*. *Εὐσέβεια* and *φιλανθρωπία* are often mentioned together. Thus, almost in the words of the Gospel, he declares that there are two great commandments,—piety and holiness towards God, and love and justice towards men. Under these, innumerable lesser details are comprehended. *ἔστι δὲ τῶν κατὰ μέρος ἀμυνήτων λόγων καὶ δογ-*

μάτων δύο τὰ ἀνωτάτω κεφάλαια, τὸ τε πρὸς Θεὸν δι' εὐσεβείας καὶ ὁσιότητος, καὶ τὸ πρὸς ἀνθρώπους διὰ φιланθρωπίας καὶ δικαιοσύνης. (ii. 391.) But the highest form of virtue is love to God, which Philo describes as the last stage of mystic initiation. They who possess this gift are inspired, ὑπ' ἔρωτος ἄρπασθέντες οὐραγίου καθάπερ οἱ βακχενόμενοι καὶ κορυβαντιῶντες ἐνθουσιάζουσιν μέχρις ἂν τὸ ποθοῦμενον ἴδωσιν (ii. 473.); they are free, and participate as friends in the power of the king,—they are gods themselves, as Moses has ventured to call them.

Philo, like the Apostle Paul, regarded faith, hope, and love as the fairest graces of a religious soul. In Philo as well as in St. Paul, in different senses and under different points of view, faith and love seem either of them to occupy the first place, while hope lies more in the background, and is the germ of the other two. In both, faith is almost sight; love occupies nearly the same position in Philo as in the Gospel and Epistles of St. John. Hope, as with the early Christian it was closely connected with the sorrowfulness of his life in this world, so in Philo seems to arise out of the degenerate state of the Jewish race, from which the righteous could by hope only escape.

It has been already remarked, that faith in the Pauline view, as opposed to the law, is not the faith of Philo. But, on the other hand, it must be also observed, that Philo regards the law in a different manner from the Scribes and Pharisees at Jerusalem. He speaks of certain who laid aside the letter, and regarded only the spirit of the sacred writings, who, like St. Paul, would have said,—“Let no man judge you of a new moon, or of a sabbath;” and of such he disapproves. Yet he too, in a spirit which partakes of that both of Seneca and the Hebrew prophets, utters warnings against lip service and superstition; the whole of the sacrificial language of the Old Testament receives from him a spiritual or ideal meaning. Thus he calls πίστις κάλλιστον καὶ ἄμωμον ἱερεῖον; in the same spirit he says, that the holiest and most acceptable sacrifice is a soul purified by virtue and age; “from holy men the least gifts find acceptance with God, and even if they bring nothing else, in bringing themselves, who most perfectly fulfil the law of goodness, they bring the best sacrifice,—“It is not of the virtue, but of the sacrifice that God takes

account." (ii. 15.) On such a theory it would be unnecessary that sacrifices should be offered at all. Nevertheless, by reason of the frailty of men, God, he says, was pleased to give them a temple made with hands, which is one only temple, even as God is one, and to this He compelled men to assemble as a test of their piety. 'This temple is the image of the world, as the passover is of a change of life, and the rite of circumcision of purity of heart.

With this idealising tendency he seems to have united the more popular belief of ransom and sacrifice. Thus he speaks of the Levites as the ransom of the children of Israel, and says, on Num. iii. 12., that what the sacred writer probably intends to teach, is, that every good man is the ransom of the bad. In like manner his interpretation of the offering up of Isaac implies that he believed in the efficacy of sacrifice in its most literal sense, for he compares it with the human sacrifices of the heathen.

Points of parallelism in the preceding section are as follows:—

1. The view that righteousness is the gift of God to man, not of debt, but of grace.
2. Faith, hope, and charity. Faith is the substance of things hoped for; without faith it is impossible to please God. What a man seeth, why doth he yet hope for? The greatest of them is charity.
3. The two great commandments in the law.
4. The metaphorical use of sacrifice and of circumcision.
5. Particular expressions: "stewards of the divine mysteries," "the true riches," "hungering and thirsting after righteousness."

CONCLUSION.

WE have thus completed a sketch of the principal points of Philo's system, if, indeed, that can be called a system the connecting link of which is no unity of idea, but the mere continuity of the Mosaic writings. On those writings were incrustated the views of the Alexandrian philosophy. They soon worked themselves into the fabric itself, and covered it with grotesque and monstrous fictions. More precisely considered, they are not a system at all, but a method of applying Plato and the Greek philosophy to the Jewish Scriptures.

This method, however, was not the fancy of an individual, but the method of a school. The age which compares the present with the past, seeks to adapt ancient monuments to itself. In a place of learning, like Alexandria, swarming with teachers and rhetoricians, the natural tendency of the human mind was not likely to be long without an expression. Even Plato himself had found it an instrument of implanting his lessons in the human mind under an ancient guise too convenient to be neglected. The instant that the bright thought occurred to some Euhemerus that all these things were an allegory, an idea which the Greek mythology itself seemed to suggest, it might be indefinitely expanded and applied. There was no first principle of knowledge to check its growth. But for the disposition to receive it, such an interpretation of the law of Moses would have seemed as strange and eccentric to the Alexandrian, as a similar allegorical explanation might to us of Blackstone's Commentaries. The very mode in which its use is restricted among ourselves, is an illustration of this. Those who in our own day applied the allegorical method to the prophets, would be thought fanciful,—to the Books of Kings or Chronicles absolutely insane; while in the treatment of the Book of Revelation, it would seem to have its natural application. The child-like simplicity of the Alexandrians admitted every application of it; nor did they see any absurdity in the grammatical studies of Abraham, or the Greek instructors of Moses. (ii. 8.)

The effects of such a predisposing belief may be traced still in modern commentaries on Scripture. Of that method of interpretation which (though found more commonly in the Fathers and schoolmen than in Protestant divines) has survived to our own day, the Alexandrian theology is the original source. Is this conceivable, unless it had been based on some principle of human nature? Could a method of interpretation which, though almost wholly destitute of any objective truth, has survived 2000 years, have been due only to the genius of Origen or of Philo?

We might reply, "impossible," on such *à priori* grounds only. No system like that of Philo could ever have sprung up full-blown; it would have been an unmeaning absurdity, unless many generations

of teachers and hearers had preceded. No system which was the mere idiosyncrasy of an individual, could have retained so tenacious a hold on the human mind. There is no need, however, to rest the position that Philo was the representative of his age on mere *à priori* arguments. More direct proofs are the following :—

First, the “undesigned” coincidences between Philo and the New Testament can be explained on no other hypothesis than the wide diffusion of the Alexandrian modes of thought. Was it by chance only that Philo and St. John struck upon the same conception of the λόγος, or that the Alexandrian philosophy transferred to the λόγος the manifestations of God in the Old Testament which we commonly refer to Christ? Was it by chance merely that the very same figures of speech are applied to the λόγος which we receive in the New Testament from the lips of our Lord and His Apostles, such as the manna, the living water, the rock that flowed in the wilderness? Whatever doubt may arise as to their application in the same sense by both, there can be no doubt that they are a part of the language and mode of thinking of the age, for of designed imitation, either in the one or the other, there is not a trace.

Secondly, it may be observed, that in several passages of his work Philo refers to the allegorical interpretation as already of ancient date. In some places he gives several explanations of a particular passage, showing that he was not himself its first interpreter. In speaking of the Therapeutæ and Essenes (to whom he seems to stand in nearly the same relation as Basil or Chrysostom to St. Antony and the Christian hermits), he gives a description of their preaching, and speaks of the allegorical method as peculiar to them. He says that they are scattered in many parts of the world: “for it must needs be, that Greece and the stranger should have part in the perfect good.” (ii. 474. 477.) He also uses the expression, οἱ τῆς ἀλληγορίας κά-νοτες (as though an art of allegorising existed just as much as an art of rhetoric), and every where presupposes the idea of his method as well known.

Thirdly, there are traces of the same application of the Old Testament much older than Philo. Gfrörer's remark has been already quoted, that in eight passages out of twelve in which apparitions

of the Divine Being occur in the Books of Moses, alterations have been made by the translator. The Book of Jesus, the son of Sirach, probably a work of Palestine origin and of the second century before Christ, the fragments of Aristeas and Aristobulus, also of the second century, portions of the Sibylline oracles, which are acknowledged to be the work of an Alexandrian Jew, and, above all, the Book of Wisdom, contain the same idealism, the same conception of wisdom or of the Word of God, and the commencement of the same allegorical method. The writings just mentioned were all older than Philo: and if we turn to those which followed him,

Fourthly, the remains of the earliest Alexandrian Fathers, not more than a century and a half after Philo, bear the impress of the same school. What can be more unreasonable than to suppose the whole system sprang up afresh in the mind of Clement or of Origen? Whence could they have derived it? Or how happened it in their writings to be so much more freely and commonly applied to the Old Testament than to the New? No other answer can be given to these questions but that they were the natural heirs of the old traditional method of Alexandria.

Philo, then, was neither the first author of the system, nor did it end with him, though he represents probably its highest development. There preceded him writers, who, by a series of steps, led up to the entrance of the mystical temple. In him, first, we find the complete personification of the λόγος, and the elaborate use of the allegorical method. The Christian writers who followed him had a higher aim, which freed them from many of his puerilities. They seldom or hardly ever disavowed the letter of the text; they seldom or hardly ever made numbers into Pythagorean mysteries. They did not write for mere contemplative ascetics; they freed themselves in a great degree from knowledge falsely so called. Still they were his natural successors. The Spirit with them had taken the place of the letter, and the sacred hieroglyphic was lighted up with a divine ray of truth. But they remained wandering in the mazes of the labyrinth, though the roof had been taken off, and the midday sun was shining in the heavens.

It is a great proof of the importance of Philo's works for the illustration of Christianity, that some early Christian writers show an inclination to claim him as a Christian. To us he is unmistakably a Jew. What is there in his writings that has produced this opposite impression, (1.) on these Fathers, and (2.) on ourselves?

1. They found in his writings what was wholly unintelligible to them, unless identified with Christ and the Gospel; the conceptions of "the Word," "the Holy Spirit," "grace," "faith;" of "the Spiritual," or, rather, "the Ideal Israel."

2. They found these ideas drawn from the Old Testament by the same method of interpretation they were themselves in the habit of employing.

3. They found the same, or nearly the same, language with that of Philo in Christian writers.

4. His writings appeared to them orthodox in their tone; that is to say, they always leaned to the side of the mystical and spiritual.

5. The influences that produced Philo were still unconsciously acting upon them.

6. That they should have seen Christianity in Philo, was far less strange than that Philo should have traced Greek philosophy in Judaism, and Judaism in Greek philosophy.

A Jewish philosopher*, was asked when he would become a Christian: he replied, "when Christians cease to be Jews." In the spirit of this reply it may be said: *ἡ Παῦλος φιλωνίζει ἡ Φίλων χριστιανός ἐστι*—either Philo is a Christian, or St. Paul learned Christianity from Philo. And it must be admitted that Philo cannot but exercise a great influence on our conception of the Gospel. As we read his works the truth flashes upon us that the language of the New Testament is not absolutely isolated from the language of the world in general: we have found the missing link; the Spirit rather than the letter is new, the whole not the parts, the life more than the form. In the preceding pages, the chief similarities in the writings of Philo and St. Paul have been brought together; the differences between them remain to be considered.

1. Philo was strictly a Jew. It was his reverence for the law which led him to evade the law, and then to regard this evasion

as its natural meaning. Taken in his sense, the law was ever binding, and seemed only to derive additional support from Greek philosophy. Nothing was further from his thoughts than its abrogation. He was not the founder of a new age, but much more truly the expression or reflection of a former one. Though living on the edge of a volcano which was to open and swallow up his race, he had no conception that the Jewish way of life could ever cease, or the daily sacrifice fail to be offered. At the very moment the law was departing, it seemed to him to contain everlasting treasures of wisdom and knowledge. The veriest zealot or Pharisee at Jerusalem could not have clung with greater tenacity than Philo to the hope and privileges of the Jewish race.

II. Philo's system has been described as the interpretation of the law by the light of the Greek philosophy. There are passages also, in which he borrows from the prophets; in which the Spirit of Isaiah or Micah, expressed in the words, "I will have mercy and not sacrifice," animates his commentary on the law. They are few, however, in comparison with the great mass of his interpretations. Aristotle, Plato, the Sceptic, the Pythagorean, the Stoic, are his real commentators, from whom he derives his forms of thought, his tricks with numbers, his methodical arrangement, his staid and rhetorical diction. Of this heathen element there is no trace in the New Testament. If there be ground for thinking that St. Paul had attained considerable Greek culture, there is no trace in him of a heathen spirit. There is no sentence of any philosopher recorded in his Epistles; no doctrine of which we feel more able to say that it derives its origin from Plato than from Aristotle, from the Stoic than from the Epicurean. While the writings of Philo are a coat of many colours, an eclectic patchwork in which the individuality of the writer is lost, in St. Paul there is nothing that we can trace to others so as, in any degree, to interfere with the harmony and unity of the author's character.

III. Less prominent than Greek philosophy, but still clearly discernible in Philo, is the influence of that widely spread and undefined spirit, which may be termed Orientalism. It is the spirit which puts knowledge in the place of truth, which confounds moral with phy-

sical purity, which seeks to attain the perfection of the soul in abstraction and separation from matter. It is the spirit which attempts to account for evil, by removing it to a distance from God; letting it drop by a series of descents from heaven to earth. It is the spirit, lastly, which regards religion as an initiation into mystery. How little of all this we find in the New Testament? Of the abhorrence of matter — that deeply-rooted tenet of the East — absolutely nothing. The purity and holiness of which St. Paul speaks, can never be mistaken for the putting away of the filth of the flesh. However often he introduces the thought of angels and spirits, yet never can it be imagined that he considered them as links in the chain let down from the Author of all good to the evils and miseries of mankind. And although he speaks of mere earthly and human relations as mysteries, in a sense in which we can scarcely realise them to be so, yet under this mystical language ever lies deep the moral and spiritual life hidden with Christ and God.

IV. There may often occur a great similarity of language between two writers, although their first and leading thought is wholly different. Two systems of philosophy may be described; the one as practical the other as speculative, the one ideal and the other real; they may have an analogy in the details, while their first principles are different; just as there may be an analogy between the animal and vegetable worlds, while the idea of the one is quite distinct from that of the other. Such a difference there is between Philo and the New Testament,—a difference not so much in the parts as in the whole. Philo may be characterised as mystical and ideal, the New Testament as moral and spiritual; the one a system of knowledge, the other a rule of life. Yet the terms wisdom, knowledge, prudence, faith, charity, as well as many others, may be common to both, and be applied by both, in senses which have a relation to each other, yet are really different. The wisdom and knowledge of Philo mean chiefly allegorical explanations of the Scriptures; the wisdom and knowledge of the New Testament are inseparable from life and action, and denote the perfect moderation of Christian life and character. A similar difference is traceable in the use of the Old Testament Scripture. The allegory which to one is but the thin

veil of fiction which overspreads the Greek philosophy, to the other is the instrument of preaching a moral or religious lesson. What is every thing to the one is but secondary and subordinate in the other. What is the whole of Philo is but rare and occasional in St. Paul.

V. Another strikingly different aspect of Philo and the Gospel is that the one is the religion of the few, the other of the many. That the refined mysticism which Philo taught as the essence of religion, could be communicated to the "accursed multitude," never entered into his conceptions. He knew nothing of the Gospel preached to the poor. Once or twice he holds up the Gentile as a reproof to the Jew; nothing was less natural to his thoughts than that they were the true Israel. His Gospel is not that of humanity, but of philosophers and of ascetics. Finding the world evil, he seeks not to convert it, but to retreat from it. There is no trace in him of that faith which made St. Paul go forth in the spirit of a conqueror. In another way also the exclusiveness of Philo may be contrasted with the first Christian teaching. The object of the Gospel is real, present, substantial,—an object such as men may see with their eyes, and hold in their hands; and the truths which are taught are such as apply to human nature, and instantaneously supply its wants and soothe its sorrows. But in Philo the object is shadowy, distant, indistinct; whether an idea or a fact we scarcely know, such as is in no degree commensurate with the wants of mankind in general or even with those of a particular individual. Were we to come nearer to it, it would vanish away; in the presence of the temple services, and of the daily sacrifice, it could scarcely have sprung up; as we analyse and criticise it, it dissolves in our hands; even if taken without criticism, it cannot exert any real influence over the heart and conduct.

To sum up this part of our subject: Philo was a Jew, St. Paul a Christian. Philo an eclectic, St. Paul spoke of himself as the Spirit gave him utterance. Philo was an Eastern mystic, St. Paul preached the resurrection of the body. Philo was an idealiser, St. Paul a spiritualiser of the Old Testament. Philo was a philosopher, St. Paul a preacher; the one taught a system for the few, the other a universal religion.

These general differences will be found also to pervade the mode of

treating particular subjects in Philo and the New Testament : — (a.) For example the words λόγος and πνεῦμα occur in both, and in both stand in some intimate relation to each other. Neither can it be said, that the λόγος in Philo is a merely physical notion ; or denied, that most of the predicates attributed to Christ are applied also to the λόγος. The great difference is, that the idea in the one case proceeds and radiates from a real person, whom “ our eyes have seen, and our hands have handled, the Word of Life ;” in the other case, the idea of the λόγος just ends with a person, or rather leaves us at last in doubt whether it is not a quality only or mode of operation in the Divine Being. It begins with being unintelligible ; it is not the “ open,” but the “ closed secret ” of Divine Providence. The λόγος in the Alexandrian sense occurs in the New Testament only at the commencement of the Gospel of St. John ; it has there a definite application to Christ. It is like an expression borrowed from another system, the language of which was widely spread, and just for once transferred to Christ, lest the want of it should seem to take away anything from His honour. In Philo the whole system centres not in a person, nor in a fact, nor in a moral truth, but in the word λόγος. Every where both in the book of nature and the book of the law, the λόγος only is seen. If in Scripture the same predicates are applied to Christ as in Philo to the λόγος, it is not that they were transferred from one to the other, but that the same words naturally suggested themselves in both cases to the Jewish mind to express an analogous idea. Christ is called μεσίτης ἀρχιερεύς ; not because these words had previously been appropriated to the λόγος, but because the disciple now believed the same attributes truly to belong to Christ which had formerly been attached to the λόγος.

Both λόγος and πνεῦμα are spoken of by Philo as communicated to us by God, and as dwelling in the heart of man, — “ The Spirit bearing witness with our spirit.” But however close may be the resemblance between the language used, there is a great difference in its meaning, which really depends on the ideas which are attached to λόγος and πνεῦμα. “ The Word of God,” “ the Spirit of God,” “ communion with God and man,” the very name of God Himself, all these terms may be applied equally to any Pantheistic or Gnostic system, but in

senses how different! They may be as much opposed as light and darkness, or good and evil, or rest and action, or fate and freedom, as mystic absorption and the life of Christ.

The difference between Philo's conception of the *πνεῦμα* and that of the New Testament may be summed up as follows: 1. In Philo it occurs much less frequently, and has a far less important place in the scheme of truth. 2. It is more of an abstraction, being scarcely distinguishable from a quality in the human mind, or an attribute of the Divine Being. 3. It is partly blended with a physical notion of the wind. It has hardly a separate existence at all, but is a sort of modification of the *λόγος*.

(β.) Yet wider and more important differences are traceable in the moral and spiritual character of the doctrines of Philo when compared with the Gospel. We have seen that it would be untrue to say that Philo knew nothing of the Christian *λόγος* or *πνεῦμα*. Still more untrue would it be to say that he knew nothing of the doctrines of grace. Like St. Paul, he could have said that God was the Giver of all good; like St. Paul, he knew that the good could suffer for the evil, even as Christ, the just for the unjust. He could have said, "When ye have done all, count yourselves to be unprofitable servants." Such a doctrine, we have seen, would have been by no means new to him. But it was to him rather theoretical than practical; it flowed with him out of a consideration of the Divine nature, but never became his rule of life. Of real humility, such as befits the creature towards the Creator, there is no trace in his writings. And as his view of religion and morality was wanting in depth and intensity, so also it was wanting in breadth. It did not embrace all mankind, or all time. It could never have attained to the sublimity of St. Paul: — "In Jesus Christ there is neither Jew nor Greek, barbarian, Scythian, bond or free."

(γ.) If Philo falls far short of St. Paul in the universality of his view, he does so at least equally in his conception of faith. Both in Philo and St. Paul faith is trust in God, and belief in His promises. But in St. Paul it is more than this, a faith such as may remove mountains, a confidence that all things are ours, whether life or death, or things present or things to come. It is the instrument of union

with Christ, and, through Him, of communion with all mankind. The faith of Philo is bound up in the curtains of the tabernacle; the faith of St. Paul rends asunder the veil which divides the Jew from the world, and earth from heaven.

(δ.) Once more : it is fair to estimate the difference between Philo and the Gospel by the result. The one may have guided a few more solitaries or Essenes to the rocks of the Nile or the settlements of the Dead Sea ; the other has changed the world. The one is a dead unmeaning literature, lingering amid the progress of mankind ; the other has been a principle of life to the intellect as well as the heart. While the one has ceased to exist, the other has survived, without decay, the changes in government and the revolutions in thought of 1800 years.

From the above statements, as we pass from the Epistles of St. Paul to other parts of the New Testament, only a slight deduction has to be made from the above statements as we pass from the Epistles. Philo may be allowed to stand in a nearer relation to the Gospel of St. John, and to the Epistle to the Hebrews, than to any of the writings of St. Paul. There is truth in saying that St. John wrote to supply a better Gnosis, and that in the Epistle to the Hebrews a higher use is made of the Alexandrian ideas, and the figures of the Mosaic dispensation. That is to say, the form of both is an expression of the same tendency which we trace in the Eastern or Alexandrian Gnosis. But admitting this similarity of form, the difference of spirit which separates St. John or the author of the Hebrews from Philo, is hardly less wide than that which divides him from St. Paul. The λόγος of Philo is an idea, of St. John a fact ; of the one intellectual, of the other spiritual ; the one taking up his abode in the soul of the mystic, while the other is the indwelling light of all mankind. Philo would have shrunk from "the idea of ideas," as he termed the λόγος, being one "whom our eyes have seen and our hands have handled ;" he would have turned away with contempt from the death of Christ. And although the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews approaches more nearly to Philo in his conception of faith, and carries the allegorical method further than St. Paul, both in the particular instance of Mel-

elisedek, and in his application of it to the whole of the Mosaic dispensation, and seems even to regard such knowledge as a sort of perfection, Heb. vi. 1., he too never leaves the groundwork of fact and spiritual religion.

Alexandrianism was not the seed of the great tree which was to cover the earth, but the soil in which it grew up. It was not the body of which Christianity was the soul, but the vesture in which it folded itself—the old bottle into which the new wine was poured. When with “stammering lips and other tongues” the first preachers passed beyond the borders of the sacred land, Alexandrianism was the language which they spoke, not the faith which they taught. It was mystical and dialectical, not moral and spiritual; for the few, not for the many; for the Jewish therapeutæ, not for all mankind. It spoke of a Holy Ghost; of a word; of a divine man; of a first and second Adam; of the faith of Abraham; of bread which came down from heaven: but knew nothing of the God who had made of one blood all nations of the earth; of the victory over sin and death; of the cross of Christ. It was a picture, a shadow, a surface, a cloud above, catching the rising light ere He appeared. It had pierced the veil of the tabernacle, to see through a glass, dimly, dreams of its own creation.

END OF THE FIRST VOLUME.

LONDON:
A. and G. A. SPOTTISWOODE,
New-street-Square.

MURRAY'S BRITISH CLASSICS.

PUBLISHING IN DEMY OCTAVO MONTHLY VOLUMES.

Examiner. — "Mr. Murray's British Classics, so edited and printed as to take the highest place in any library. Beyond all question the cheapest books of the day."

Athenæum. — "Those who love to collect our standard authors in handsome library editions, may well congratulate themselves on the issue."

Notes and Queries. — "Distinguished by skilful editorship, beautiful and legible type, fine paper, compactness of bulk, and economy of price."

Quarterly Review. — "A series of the British Classics which is undoubtedly the best selected and edited, the cheapest and the handsomest that has ever issued from the press."

THE FOLLOWING WORKS ARE NOW COMPLETED.

I.

JOHNSON'S LIVES OF THE ENGLISH POETS. Edited with Corrective and Explanatory Notes. By PETER CUNNINGHAM, F.S.A. 3 vols. 8vo. 22s. 6d.

"The most popular and entertaining of all Dr. Johnson's works."—*Croker.*

"The richest, most beautiful, and, indeed, most perfect, production of Johnson's pen."—*Boswell.*

"This Edition is destined hereafter to be the standard one in English literature. Mr. Cunningham has gone about his work in a workmanlike manner."—*Literary Gazette.*

II.

GIBBON'S DECLINE AND FALL OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE. Edited, with Notes, By WILLIAM SMITH, LL.D., and very carefully compiled Index. Portrait and Maps. 8 vols. 8vo. 60s.

This Edition includes the Autobiography of Gibbon, and is distinguished by careful revision of the text, verification of all the references to ancient writers, and Notes incorporating the researches of Modern Scholars and Travellers.

"An edition incomparably the best in every respect that has hitherto appeared."—*Examiner.*

"The task of editing could not have fallen into abler hands. If there be any man capable of bringing to bear upon the improvement of Gibbon's work the various additions which have been made, to our knowledge, since his time, it is Dr. Wm. Smith."—*Athenæum.*

III.

GOLDSMITH'S WORKS. Edited, with Notes. By PETER CUNNINGHAM, F.S.A. Vignettes. 4 vols. 8vo. 30s.

"Well edited, and beautifully printed."—*The Times.*

"The best editions have been consulted, and gives evidence of careful and conscientious editing."—*Guardian.*

"The first complete and accurate reprint of Goldsmith. Numerous errors which had crept into previous editions are corrected, omitted passages are restored, and entire pieces have been added."—*Quarterly Review.*

JOHN MURRAY, Albemarle Street.

ROBERTSON'S CHURCH HISTORY.

This day, One Volume (544 pp.), 8vo. 12s.'

HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH TO THE PONTIFICATE OF GREGORY THE GREAT, A. D. 590. Intended for General Readers as well as for Students in Theology. By Rev. JAMES C. ROBERTSON, M. A., Vicar of Bekebourne.

"ROBERTSON'S 'CHURCH HISTORY' is to be spoken of with much respect as a useful, learned, and conscientious book. He speaks of it himself, indeed, in language of excessive modesty, as merely 'a readable introduction' to an ecclesiastical history. No doubt it is a compilation, but one very ably and fairly done; the authorities, English and foreign, who have been consulted, are the best writers on the different subjects."—*Guardian*.

"ROBERTSON'S CHURCH HISTORY traces with great distinctness the history of the Church, or rather of the Christians who composed it; exhibits briefly, yet sufficiently, the leading persons, among the Fathers and Martyrs; expounds succinctly the opinions or doctrines of the different heresies, and judiciously comments upon the whole in a tone alike removed from fanaticism or coldness."—*Spectator*.

"ROBERTSON'S CHURCH HISTORY brings within a reasonable compass the most important events, and the most conspicuous features of the progressive development of the external form of her doctrines and her institutions. The spirit in which the narrative is composed is that of a sound English Churchman. Clergymen and Divinity students will find the work exceedingly valuable as a guide in the prosecution of their studies."—*John Bull*.

"ROBERTSON'S CHURCH HISTORY. Theological students will find the learned annotations to this volume of the greatest use. It has a table of the various works cited, and is supplied with an excellent index. Its genuine scholarship and wide research will obtain for its author considerable reputation."—*The Press*.

"ROBERTSON'S CHURCH HISTORY enjoys the rare merit of being free from partisanship, or at least of effectually excluding it from historical investigation; and the diligence with which the author has searched for the truth, as well as the clearness with which he has exhibited the results, will render his book a popular source of information on the subject."—*Morning Post*.

"ROBERTSON'S CHURCH HISTORY only professes to supply us with a 'readable introduction' to the early history of the Church; but with the volume in our hands we are disposed to rank it somewhat higher. It is written by a man who understands the bearings of his subject, and exhibits more than ordinary skill in the construction of his materials; but the features we select for special commendation are his candour, honesty, and independence in handling controverted questions."—*Journal of Classical and Sacred Philology*.

"ROBERTSON'S CHURCH HISTORY during the first six centuries is a manly, solid, straightforward, and clear-headed performance, evincing large scholarship, prompt and vigorous discernment. The author is a man of moderate views, but nowise wanting in decision and firmness in expressing them. Modest of pretension, and without much that is absolutely new, it presents a faithful and compact digest of all that modern research has rendered available for such an undertaking."—*New York Churchman*.

"ROBERTSON'S CHURCH HISTORY is of great service to the educated classes of the British communion, by furnishing them with a really good compendium of ancient Church history. Although the present publication is not called a first volume of *General Church history*, but appears in an entire form, there are not wanting indications of the author's purpose to continue his work, and we sincerely wish him health and strength to do so."—*Scottish Ecclesiastical Journal*.

JOHN MURRAY, Albemarle Street.

ALDEMABLE STREET, LONDON.
January, 1855.

MR. MURRAY'S GENERAL LIST OF WORKS.

- ABBOTT'S (REV. J.) Philip Musgrave; or, Memoirs of a Church of England Missionary in the North American Colonies. Post 8vo. 2s. 6d.
- ABERCROMBIE'S (JOHN, M.D.) Enquiries concerning the Intellectual Powers and the Investigation of Truth. *Fourteenth Edition.* Fcap. 8vo. 6s. 6d.
- Philosophy of the Moral Feelings. *Ninth Edition.* Fcap. 8vo. 4s.
- Pathological and Practical Researches on the Diseases of the Stomach, the Intestinal Canal, the Liver, and other Viscera of the Abdomen. *Third Edition.* Fcap. 8vo. 6s.
- ACLAND'S (REV. CHARLES) Popular Account of the Manners and Customs of India, Illustrated with Numerous Anecdotes. Post 8vo. 2s. 6d.
- ADDISON'S WORKS. A New Edition, with a New Life and Notes. By REV. WHITWELL ELWIN. 4 Vols. 8vo. *In Preparation.*
- ÆSCHYLUS. (The Agamemnon and Choephore). *A New Edition* of the Text, with Notes, Critical, Explanatory, and Philological, for the Use of Students. By REV. W. PEILE, D.D. *Second Edition.* 2 Vols. 8vo. 9s. each.
- ÆSOP'S FABLES. A New Version, chiefly from the Original Greek. By REV. THOMAS JAMES, M.A. Illustrated with 100 Woodcuts, by JOHN TENNIEL. *21st Edition.* Post 8vo. 2s. 6d.
- AGRICULTURAL (THE) JOURNAL. Published (half-yearly) by the Royal Agricultural Society of England. 8vo. 10s.
- AMBER-WITCH (THE). The most interesting Trial for Witchcraft ever known. Edited by DR. MEINHOLD. Translated from the German by LADY DUFF GORDON. Post 8vo. 2s. 6d.
- ARABIAN NIGHTS. A New Translation. By E. W. LANE. With Explanatory Notes. 600 Woodcuts. Medium 8vo. 21s.
- ARISTOPHANES. The Birds and the Clouds. Translated from SUVERUS by W. R. HAMILTON, F.R.S. 2 Vols. Post 8vo. 9s.
- ARTHUR'S (LITTLE) History of England. By LADY CALCOTT. *Seventeenth Edition.* Woodcuts. 18mo.
- AUNT IDA'S Walks and Talks; a Story Book for Children. By a LADY. Woodcuts. 16mo. 5s.

ADMIRALTY PUBLICATIONS; Issued by direction of the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty:—

1. A MANUAL OF SCIENTIFIC ENQUIRY, for the Use of Officers in H.M. Navy and Travellers in General. By Various Hands. Edited by Sir J. F. HERSCHEL, Bart. *Second Edition.* Post 8vo. 10s. 6d.
2. AIRY'S ASTRONOMICAL OBSERVATIONS MADE AT GREENWICH 1836 to 1847. Royal 4to. 50s. each.
3. — APPENDIX TO THE ASTRONOMICAL OBSERVATIONS. 1836, 1837, 1842, 8s. each; and 1847, 14s. Royal 4to.

CONTENTS.

1836.—Bessel's Refraction Tables.
 Tables for converting Errors of R.A. and N.P.D. into Errors of Longitude and Ecliptic P.D.

1837.—Logarithms of Sines and Cosines to every Ten Seconds of Time.
 Table for converting Sidereal into Mean Solar Time.

1842.—Catalogue of 1439 Stars.
 1847.—Twelve Years' Catalogue of Stars.
4. — MAGNETICAL AND METEOROLOGICAL OBSERVATIONS. 1840 to 1847. Royal 4to. 50s. each.
5. — ASTRONOMICAL, MAGNETICAL, AND METEOROLOGICAL OBSERVATIONS, 1848 to 1852. Royal 4to. 50s. each.
6. — REDUCTION OF THE OBSERVATIONS OF PLANETS. 1750 to 1830. Royal 4to. 50s.
7. — LUNAR OBSERVATIONS. 1750 to 1830. 2 Vols. Royal 4to. 50s. each.
8. BERNOULLI'S SEXCENTENARY TABLE. *London*, 1779. 4to. 5s.
9. BESSEL'S AUXILIARY TABLES FOR HIS METHOD OF CLEARING LUNAR DISTANCES. 8vo.
10. — FUNDAMENTA ASTRONOMIÆ: *Regiomonti*. 1818. Folio. 60s.
11. BIRD'S METHOD OF CONSTRUCTING MURAL QUADRANTS. *London*, 1768. 4to. 2s. 6d.
12. — METHOD OF DIVIDING ASTRONOMICAL INSTRUMENTS. *London*, 1767. 4to. 2s. 6d.
13. COOK, KING, AND BAYLY'S ASTRONOMICAL OBSERVATIONS. *London*, 1782. 4to. 21s.
14. EIFFER'S ACCOUNT OF IMPROVEMENTS IN CHRONOMETERS. 4to. 2s.
15. ENCKE'S BERLINER JAHRBUCH, for 1830. *Berlin*, 1828. 8vo. 9s.
16. GROOMBRIDGE'S CATALOGUE OF CIRCUMPOLAR STARS. 4to. 10s.
17. HARRISON'S PRINCIPLES OF HIS TIME-KEEPER. PLATES 1767. 4to. 5s.
18. HUTTON'S TABLES OF THE PRODUCTS AND POWERS OF NUMBERS. 1781. Folio. 7s. 6d.
19. LAX'S TABLES FOR FINDING THE LATITUDE AND LONGITUDE. 1821. 8vo. 10s.
20. LUNAR OBSERVATIONS at GREENWICH. 1763 to 1819. Compared with the Tables, 1821. 4to. 7s. 6d.
21. — DISTANCES of the MOON'S CENTRE from the PLANETS. 1822, 8s.; 1823, 4s. 6d. 1824 to 1835. 8vo. 4s. each.
22. MASKELYNE'S ACCOUNT OF THE GOING OF HARRISON'S WATCH. 1767. 4to. 2s. 6d.
23. MAYER'S THEORIA LUNÆ JUXTA SYSTEMA NEWTONIANUM. 4to. 2s. 6d.
24. — TABULÆ MOTUUM SOLIS ET LUNÆ. 1770. 4to. 5s.
25. — ASTRONOMICAL OBSERVATIONS MADE AT GOTTINGEN, from 1756 to 1761. 1826. Folio. 7s. 6d.

ADMIRALTY PUBLICATIONS—*continued.*

26. NAUTICAL ALMANACS, from 1767 to 1856. 8vo. 2s. 6d. each.
27. ————— SELECTIONS FROM THE ADDITIONS
up to 1812. 8vo. 5s. 1834-54. 8vo. 5s.
28. ————— SUPPLEMENTS, 1828 to 1833, 1837 and 1839.
8vo. 2s. each.
29. ————— TABLE requisite to be used with the N.A.
1781. 8vo. 5s.
30. POND'S ASTRONOMICAL OBSERVATIONS. 1811 to 1835. 4to. 21s.
each.
31. RAMSDEN'S ENGINE for DIVIDING MATHEMATICAL INSTRUMENTS.
4to. 5s.
32. ————— ENGINE for DIVIDING STRAIGHT LINES. 4to. 5s.
33. SABINE'S PENDULUM EXPERIMENTS to DETERMINE THE FIGURE
OF THE EARTH. 1825. 4to. 40s.
34. SHEPHERD'S TABLES for CORRECTING LUNAR DISTANCES. 1772.
Royal 4to. 21s.
35. ————— TABLES, GENERAL, of the MOON'S DISTANCE
from the SUN, and 10 STARS. 1787. Folio. 5s. 6d.
36. TAYLOR'S SEXAGESIMAL TABLE. 1780. 4to. 15s.
37. ————— TABLES OF LOGARITHMS. 4to. 3l.
38. TIARK'S ASTRONOMICAL OBSERVATIONS for the LONGITUDE
of MADEIRA. 1822. 4to. 5s.
39. ————— CHRONOMETRICAL OBSERVATIONS for DIFFERENCES
of LONGITUDE between DOVER, PORTSMOUTH, and FALMOUTH. 1823.
4to. 5s.
40. VENUS and JUPITER: OBSERVATIONS of, compared with the TABLES.
London, 1822. 4to. 2s.
41. WALES' AND BAYLY'S ASTRONOMICAL OBSERVATIONS.
1777. 4to. 21s.
42. WALES' REDUCTION OF ASTRONOMICAL OBSERVATIONS
MADE IN THE SOUTHERN HEMISPHERE, 1764-1771. 1786. 4to.
10s. 6d.
- AUSTIN'S (SARAH) Fragments from German Prose Writers.
Translated, with Biographical Notes. Post. 8vo. 10s.
- Translation of Ranke's Political and Ecclesiastical
History of the Popes of Rome. *Third Edition.* 2 Vols. 8vo. 24s.
- BABBAGE'S (CHARLES) Economy of Machinery and Manufactures.
Fourth Edition. Fcap. 8vo. 6s.
- Table of the Logarithms of the Natural Numbers
from 1 to 109000. *Fourth Edition.* Royal 8vo. 6s.
- Ninth Bridgewater Treatise. *Second Edition.* 8vo.
9s. 6d.
- Reflections on the Decline of Science in England,
and on some of its Causes. 4to. 15s.
- Exposition of 1851; or, Views of the Industry, the
Science, and the Government of England. *Second Edition.* 8vo. 7s. 6d.
- BANKES' (RIGHT HON. G.) STORY OF CORFE CASTLE, with
documents relating to the Time of the Civil Wars, &c. Woodcuts. Post
8vo. 10s. 6d.
- BASSOMPIERRE'S Memoirs of his Embassy to the Court of
England in 1626. Translated, with Notes. 8vo. 9s. 6d.

BARROW'S (SIR JOHN) Autobiographical Memoir, including Reflections, Observations, and Reminiscences at Home and Abroad. From Early Life to Advanced Age. Portrait. 8vo. 16s.

— Voyages of Discovery and Research within the Arctic Regions, from 1818 to the present time, in search of a North-West Passage: with Two Attempts to reach the North Pole. Abridged and arranged from the Official Narratives. 8vo. 15s.

— (JOHN) Naval Worthies of Queen Elizabeth's Reign, their Gallant Deeds, Daring Adventures, and Services in the infant state of the British Navy. 8vo. 14s.

— Life and Voyages of Sir Francis Drake. With numerous Original Letters. Post 8vo. 2s. 6d.

BEE'S AND FLOWERS. Two Essays, by a CLERGYMAN, reprinted from the "Quarterly Review." Fcap. 8vo. 1s. each.

BELL'S (SIR CHARLES) Anatomy and Philosophy of Expression as connected with the Fine Arts. *Fourth Edition.* Plates. Impl. 8vo. 21s.

— Mechanism and Vital Endowments of the Hand as evincing Design. The Bridgewater Treatise. *Fifth Edition.* Plates. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d.

BENEDICT'S (JULES) Sketch of the Life and Works of Felix Mendelssohn Bartholdy. *Second Edition.* 8vo. 2s. 6d.

BERTHA'S Journal during a Visit to her Uncle in England. Containing a Variety of Interesting and Instructive Information. *Seventh Edition.* Woodcuts. 12mo. 7s. 6d.

— The Heiress in her Minority; or, the Progress of Character. By Author of "BERTHA'S JOURNAL." 2 Vols. 12mo.

BIRCH'S (SAMUEL) History of Ancient Pottery: Egyptian, Asiatic, Greek, Roman, Etruscan, and Celtic. With Illustrations. 8vo. (*Nearly Ready.*)

BIRT'S (W. R.) Hurricane Guide. Being an Attempt to connect the Rotatory Gale, or Revolving Storm, with Atmospheric Waves. With Circles on Cards. Post 8vo. 3s.

BIOSCOPE (THE); or, the Dial of Life explained. By GRANVILLE PENN. *Second Edition.* With Plate. 12mo. 12s.

BLAINE (ROBERTON) on the Laws of Artistic Copyright and their Defects, for Artists, Engravers, Printsellers, &c. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

BLUNT'S (REV. J. J.) Undesigned Coincidences in the Writings of the Old and New Testament, an Argument of their Veracity: with an Appendix containing Undesigned Coincidences between the Gospels, Acts, and Josephus. *Fourth Edition.* 8vo. 9s.

— Principles for the proper understanding of the Mosaic Writings, stated and applied, together with an Incidental Argument for the truth of the Resurrection of our Lord. Being the HULSEAN LECTURES for 1832. Post 8vo. 6s. 6d.

BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER. With 1000 Illustrations of Borders, Initials, and Woodcut Vignettes. *A New Edition.* Medium 8vo. 21s. cloth, 31s. 6d. calf, or 42s. morocco.

BOSWELL'S (JAMES) Life of Dr. Samuel Johnson. Including the Tour to the Hebrides, with Notes by Sir W. SCOTT. Edited by the Right Hon. JOHN WILSON CROKER. *A New Edition, with much additional Matter.* Portraits. One Volume Royal 8vo. 15s.

BORROW'S (GEORGE) *Lavengro; The Scholar—The Gipsy—and the Priest. Portrait.* 3 Vols. Post 8vo. 30s.

— *Bible in Spain; or the Journeys, Adventures, and Imprisonments of an Englishman in an Attempt to circulate the Scriptures in the Peninsula.* 3 Vols. Post 8vo. 27s., or *Cheap Edition*, 16mo, 5s.

— *Zincali, or the Gipsies of Spain; their Manners, Customs, Religion, and Language.* 2 Vols. Post 8vo. 18s., or *Cheap Edition*, 16mo. 5s.

BRAY'S (MRS.) *Life of Thomas Stothard, R.A. With Personal Reminiscences. Illustrated with Portrait and 60 Woodcuts of his chief works.* 4to. 21s.

BREWSTER'S (SIR DAVID) *Martyrs of Science, or the Lives of Galileo, Tycho Bræhe, and Kepler. Second Edition.* Fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

— *More Worlds than One. The Creed of the Philosopher and the Hope of the Christian. Sixth Edition.* Post 8vo. 6s.

BRITISH CLASSICS. A New Series of Standard English Authors, printed from the most correct text, and edited with elucidatory notes. Published in Monthly Volumes, demy 8vo., 7s. 6d. each.

Already Published.

GOLDSMITH'S WORKS. Edited by PETER CUNNINGHAM, F.S.A. Vignettes. 4 Vols.

GIBBON'S DECLINE AND FALL OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE. Edited by WILLIAM SMITH, LL.D. Portrait and Maps. 8 Vols.

JOHNSON'S LIVES OF THE ENGLISH POETS. Edited with Notes. By PETER CUNNINGHAM, F.S.A.

In Preparation.

WORKS OF ALEXANDER POPE. Edited by the RIGHT HON. JOHN WILSON CROKER. Assisted by PETER CUNNINGHAM, F.S.A.

WORKS OF DRYDEN. Edited with Notes.

HUME'S HISTORY OF ENGLAND. A new Edition, carefully revised throughout, with Notes and Commentations, to correct his errors and supply his deficiencies.

WORKS OF SWIFT. Edited with Notes.

POETICAL WORKS OF LORD BYRON. Edited, with Notes.

WORKS OF JOSEPH ADDISON. Edited, with Notes.

BRITISH ASSOCIATION REPORTS. 8vo. York and Oxford, 1831-32, 13s. 6d. Cambridge, 1833, 12s. Edinburgh, 1834, 15s. Dublin, 1835, 13s. 6d. Bristol, 1836, 12s. Liverpool, 1837, 16s. 6d. Newcastle, 1838, 15s. Birmingham, 1839, 13. 6d. Glasgow, 1840, 15s. Plymouth, 1841, 13s. 6d. Manchester, 1842, 10s. 6d. Cork, 1843, 12s. York, 1844, 20s. Cambridge, 1845, 12s. Southampton, 1846, 15s. Oxford, 1847, 18s. Swansea, 1848, 9s. Birmingham, 1849, 10s. Edinburgh, 1850, 15s. Ipswich, 1851, 16s. 6d. Belfast, 1852, 15s. Hull, 1853, 10s. 6d.

BROGDEN'S (REV. JAS.) *Illustrations of the Liturgy and Ritual of the United Church of England and Ireland. Being Sermons and Discourses selected from the Works of eminent Divines of the 17th Century.* 3 Vols. Post 8vo. 27s.

— *Catholic Safeguards against the Errors, Corruptions, and Novelties of the Church of Rome. Being Sermons and Tracts selected from the Works of eminent Divines of the 17th Century. Second Edition With Preface and Index.* 3 Vols. 8vo. 36s.

- BROOKE'S (SIR JAMES)** Journals of Events in Borneo, including the Occupation of Labuan, and a Visit to the Celebes. Together with the Expedition of H.M.S. Iris. By CAPT. RODNEY MUNDY, R.N. Plates. 2 Vols. 8vo. 32s.
- BROUGHTON'S (LORD)** Journey through Albania and other Provinces of Turkey in Europe and Asia, to Constantinople, 1809—10. *New Edition.* 2 Vols. 8vo.
- BUBBLES FROM THE BRUNNEN OF NASSAU.** By an OLD MAN. *Sixth Edition.* 16mo.
- BUNBURY'S (C. J. F.)** Journal of a Residence at the Cape of Good Hope; with Excursions into the Interior, and Notes on the Natural History and Native Tribes of the Country. Woodcuts. Post 8vo. 3s.
- BUNYAN (JOHN)** and Oliver Cromwell. Select Biographies. By ROBERT SOUTHBY. Post 8vo. 2s. 6d.
- BURGHESHS'S (LORD)** Memoir of the Operations of the Allied Armies under Prince Schwarzenberg and Marshal Blucher during the latter end of 1813-14. 8vo. 21s.
- Early Campaigns of the Duke of Wellington in Portugal and Spain. 8vo. 8s. 6d.
- BURN'S (LIEUT.-COL.)** French and English Dictionary of Naval and Military Technical Terms. *Third Edition.* Crown 8vo. 15s.
- BURNES' (SIR ALEXANDER)** Journey to the City of Cabool. *Second Edition.* Plates. 8vo. 18s.
- BURNS' (ROBERT)** Life. By JOHN GIBSON LOCKHART. *Fifth Edition.* Fcap. 8vo. 3s.
- BURR'S (G. D.)** Instructions in Practical Surveying, Topographical Plan-drawing, and on sketching ground without Instruments. *Second Edition.* Woodcuts. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d.
- BUXTON'S (SIR FOWELL)** Memoirs. With Selections from his Correspondence. By his Son. *Fourth Edition.* 8vo. 16s.; or, *Popular Edition.* Post 8vo. 8s. 6d.
- BYRON'S (LORD)** Life and Letters. By THOMAS MOORE. Plates. 6 Vols. Fcap. 8vo. 18s. Or, One Volume, royal 8vo 12s.
- Poetical Works. Plates. 10 Vols. Fcap. 8vo. 30s. Or, One Volume. Royal 8vo. 12s.
- Pocket Edition. 8 Vols. 24mo. 20s.
- Sold separately as follows, Price 2s. 6d. each volume:*
- | | |
|------------------|-----------------------|
| Childe Harold. | Miscellanies, 2 Vols. |
| Dramas, 2 Vols. | Beppo and Don Juan, |
| Tales and Poems. | 2 Vols. |
- Childe Harold's Pilgrimage. Illustrated Edition. With 30 Vignettes. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.
- Beauties—Poetry and Prose. Fcap. 8vo. 3s.
- BUTTMAN'S LEXILOGUS;** or, a Critical Examination of the Meaning and Etymology of numerous Greek Words and Passages, intended principally for Homer and Hesiod. Translated, and edited, with Explanatory Notes and copious Indexes, by REV. J. R. FISHLAKE. *Third Edition.* 8vo. 14s.

- BUTTMAN'S** Catalogue of Irregular Greek Verbs; With all the Tenses extant—their Formation, Meaning, and Usage, accompanied by an Index. Translated, with Notes, by REV. J. R. FISHLAKE. *Second Edition.* 8vo. 7s. 6d.
- CALVIN'S (JOHN)** Life. With Extracts from his Correspondence. By THOMAS H. DYER. Portrait. 8vo. 15s.
- CALLCOTT'S (LADY)** Little Arthur's History of England. *Seventeenth Edition.* Woodcuts. 18mo. 2s. 6d.
- CARÈME'S FRENCH COOKERY.** Translated by W. HALL. *Second Edition.* Plates. 8vo. 15s.
- CARMICHAEL'S (A. N.)** Greek Verbs. Their Formations, Irregularities, and Defects. *Second Edition.* Post 8vo. 8s. 6d.
- CARNARVON'S (LORD)** Portugal, Galicia, and the Basque Provinces. From Notes made during a Journey to those Countries. *Third Edition.* Post 8vo. 5s.
- CAMPBELL'S (LORD)** Lives of the Lord Chancellors and Keepers of the Great Seal of England. From the Earliest Times to the Death of Lord Eldon in 1638. *Third Edition.* 7 Vols. 8vo. 102s.
- Lives of the Chief Justices of England. From the Norman Conquest to the Death of Lord Mansfield. 2 Vols. 8vo. 30s.
- Life of Lord Bacon. Reprinted from the Lives of the Chancellors. Fcap. 8vo. 2s.
- (GEORGE). Modern India. A Sketch of the System of Civil Government. With some Account of the Natives and Native Institutions. *Second Edition.* 8vo. 16s.
- India as it may be. An Outline of a proposed Government and Policy. 8vo. 12s.
- (THOS.) Specimens of the British Poets. With Biographical and Critical Notices, and an Essay on English Poetry. *Third Edition.* Portrait. Royal 8vo. 15s.
- Short Lives of the British Poets. With an Essay on English Poetry. Post 8vo. 5s.
- CASTLEREAGH (THE)** DESPATCHES, from the commencement of the official career of the late Viscount Castlereagh to the close of his life. Edited by the MARQUIS OF LONDONDERRY. 12 Vols. 8vo. 14s. each.
- CATHCART'S (SIR GEORGE)** Commentaries on the War in Russia and Germany, 1812-13. Plans. 8vo. 14s.
- CEYLON.** An Historical and Descriptive Account of its Past and Present Condition. Post 8vo.
- CHARMED ROE (THE)**; or, The Story of the Little Brother and Sister. By OTTO SPECKTER. Plates. 16mo. 5s.
- CLARENDON (LORD CHANCELLOR)**; Lives of his Friends and Contemporaries, illustrative of Portraits in his Gallery. By Lady THERESA LEWIS. Portraits. 3 Vols. 8vo. 42s.
- CLARK (SIR JAMES)** On the Sanative Influence of Climate, with an Account of the Best Places for Invalids in the South of Europe, &c. *Fourth Edition.* Post 8vo. 10s. 6d.
- CLAUSEWITZ'S (GENERAL CARL VON)** Campaign of 1812, in Russia. Translated from the German. Map. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

-
- CLIVE'S (LORD) Life. By REV. G. R. GLEIG, M.A. Post 8vo. 5s.
- COLERIDGE'S (SAMUEL TAYLOR) Table-Talk. *Fourth Edition.* Portrait. Fcap. 8vo. 6s.
- (HENRY NELSON) Introductions to the Study of the Greek Classic Poets. *Third Edition.* Fcap. 8vo. 6s. 6d.
- COLONIAL LIBRARY. [See Home and Colonial Library.]
- COMBER'S (DEAN) Friendly Advice to the Roman Catholics of England. By Rev. Dr. HOOK. Fcap. 8vo. 8s.
- COOKERY (DOMESTIC). Founded on Principles of Economy and Practical Knowledge, and adapted for Private Families. *New and Cheaper Edition.* Woodcuts. Fcap. 8vo. 6s.
- CRABBE'S (REV. GEORGE) Life and Letters. By his Son. Portrait. Fcap. 8vo. 3s.
- Life and Poetical Works. Plates. 8 Vols. Fcap. 8vo. 24s.; or, One Volume. Royal 8vo. 10s. 6d.
- CUMMING'S (R. GORDON) Five Years of a Hunter's Life in the Far Interior of South Africa. *Fourth and Cheaper Edition.* With Woodcuts. 2 Vols. Post 8vo. 12s.
- CURZON'S (HON. ROBERT) Visits to the Monasteries of the Levant. *Fourth Edition.* Woodcuts. Post 8vo. 15s.
- ARMENIA AND ERZEROU. A Year on the Frontiers of Russia, Turkey, and Persia. *Third Edition.* Map and Woodcuts. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d.
- CUNNINGHAM'S (ALLAN) Life of Sir David Wilkie. With his Journals, and Critical Remarks on Works of Art. Portrait. 3 Vols. 8vo. 42s.
- Poems and Songs. Now first collected and arranged, with Biographical Notice. 24mo. 2s. 6d.
- (CAPT. J. D.) History of the Sikhs. From the Origin of the Nation to the Battle of the Sutlej. *Second Edition.* Maps. 8vo. 15s.
- (PETER) London—Past and Present. A Handbook to the Antiquities, Curiosities, Churches, Works of Art, Public Buildings, and Places connected with interesting and historical associations. *Second Edition.* Post 8vo. 16s.
- Modern London. A complete Guide for Visitors to the Metropolis. Map. 16mo. 5s.
- Environs of London. Including a circle of 25 miles round St. Paul's. With Hints for Excursions by Rail,—Road,—and River. Post 8vo. *In the Press.*
- Westminster Abbey. Its Art, Architecture, and Associations. Woodcuts. Fcap. 8vo. 1s.
- Works of Oliver Goldsmith. A New Edition now first printed from the last editions which passed under the Author's own eye. Vignettes. 4 vols. 8vo. 30s.
- Lives of Eminent English Poets. By SAMUEL JOHNSON, D.D. A New Edition, with Notes. 3 vols. 8vo. 22s. 6d.

CROKER'S (RIGHT HON. J. W.) *Progressive Geography for Children.*
Fourth Edition. 18mo. 1s. 6d.

— *Stories for Children Selected from the History of*
England. Fifteenth Edition. Woodcuts. 16mo. 2s. 6d.

— *Boswell's Life of Johnson. Including the Tour to the*
Hebrides. A New Edition. Portraits. Royal 8vo. 15s.

— *LORD HERVEY's Memoirs of the Reign of George the*
Second, from his accession to the death of Queen Caroline. Edited
with Notes. *Second and Cheaper Edition.* Portrait. 2 Vols. 8vo. 21s.

— *History of the Guillotine.* Woodcuts. Fcap. 8vo. 1s.

CROMWELL (OLIVER) and John Bunyan. *Select Biographies.*
By ROBERT SOUTHEY. Post 8vo. 2s. 6d.

DARWIN'S (CHARLES) *Journal of Researches into the Natural*
History and Geology of the Countries visited during a Voyage round the
World. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d.

DAVY'S (SIR HUMPHRY) *Consulations in Travel; or, Last Days*
of a Philosopher. *Fifth Edition.* Woodcuts. Fcap. 8vo. 6s.

— *Salmonia; or, Days of Fly Fishing. With some Account*
of the Habits of Fishes belonging to the genus Salmo. *Fourth Edition.*
Woodcuts. Fcap. 8vo. 6s.

DENNIS' (GEORGE) *Cities and Cemeteries of Etruria; or, the*
extant Local Remains of Etruscan Art. Plates. 2 Vols. 8vo. 42s.

— *Summer in Andalusia.* New Edition. Post 8vo. *In*
the Press.

DEVEREUX'S (HON. CAPT., R.N.) *Lives and Letters of the Devereux*
Earls of Essex, in the Reigns of Elizabeth, James I., and Charles I.,
1540—1646. Chiefly from unpublished documents. Portraits. 2 Vols.
8vo. 30s.

DODGSON'S (REV. C.) *Controversy of Faith; or, Advice to Candi-*
dates for Holy Orders. Containing an Analysis and Exposition of the
Argument by which the Catholic Interpretation of the Baptismal Services
is to be vindicated. 12mo. 3s.

DOG-BREAKING; *the Most Expeditious, Certain, and Easy*
Method, whether great excellence or only mediocrity be required. By
LIEUT.-COL. HUTCHINSON. *Second Edition.* Woodcuts. Fcap. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

DOMESTIC MODERN COOKERY. *Founded on Principles of*
Economy and Practical Knowledge, and adapted for Private Families.
New and Cheaper Edition. Woodcuts. Fcap. 8vo. 5s.

DOUGLASS'S (GENERAL SIR HOWARD) *Treatise on the Theory*
and Practice of Gunnery. *Fourth Edition.* Plates. 8vo. 21s.

— *Treatise on the Principle and Construction of Military*
Bridges, and the Passage of Rivers in Military Operations. *Third*
Edition. Plates. 8vo. 21s.

DRAKE'S (SIR FRANCIS) *Life, Voyages, and Exploits, by Sea and*
Land. By JOHN BARROW. *Third Edition.* Post 8vo. 2s. 6d.

DRINKWATER'S (JOHN) *History of the Siege of Gibraltar.*
1779-1783. With a Description and Account of that Garrison from the
Earliest Periods. Post 8vo. 2s. 6d.

DRYDEN'S (JOHN) Works. A New Edition, based upon Sir Walter Scott's Edition, entirely revised. 8vo. *In Preparation.*

DUDLEY'S (EARL OF) Letters to the late Bishop of Llandaff. *Second Edition.* Portrait. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

DURHAM'S (ADMIRAL SIR PHILIP) Naval Life and Services. By CAPT. ALEXANDER MURRAY. 8vo. 5s. 6d.

DYER'S (THOMAS H.) Life and Letters of John Calvin. Compiled from authentic Sources. Portrait. 8vo. 15s.

EASTLAKE (SIR CHARLES) The Schools of Painting in Italy. From the Earliest times. From the German of KUGLER. Edited, with Notes. *Third Edition.* Illustrated with 100 Engravings from the Old Masters. 2 Vols. Post 8vo.

Contributions to the Literature of the Fine Arts. 8vo. 12s.

EDWARDS' (W. H.) Voyage up the River Amazon, including a Visit to Para. Post 8vo. 2s. 6d.

EGERTON'S (HON. CAPT. FRANCIS) Journal of a Winter's Tour in India; with a Visit to Nepaul. Woodcuts. 2 Vols. Post 8vo. 18s.

ELDON'S (LORD CHANCELLOR) Public and Private Life, with Selections from his Correspondence and Diaries. By HORACE TWISS. *Third Edition.* Portrait. 2 Vols. Post 8vo. 21s.

ELLESMERE'S (LORD) Two Sieges of Vienna by the Turks. Translated from the German. Post 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Second Campaign of Radetzky in Piedmont. The Defence of Temeswar and the Camp of the Ban. From the German. Post 8vo. 6s. 6d.

Life and Character of the Duke of Wellington; a Discourse. *Second Edition.* Fcap. 8vo. 6d.

Campaign of 1812 in Russia, from the German of General Carl Von Clausewitz. Map. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

The Pilgrimage, the 18th of November, and other Poems. Post 8vo.

ELPHINSTONE'S (HON. MOUNTSTUART) History of India—the Hindoo and Mahomedan Periods. *Third Edition.* Map. 8vo. 18s.

ELWIN'S (REV. W.) Lives of Eminent British Poets. From Chaucer to Wordsworth. 4 Vols. 8vo. *In Preparation.*

ENGLAND (HISTORY OF) From the Peace of Utrecht to the Peace of Versailles, 1713—83. By LORD MAHON. *Library Edition*, 7 Vols., 8vo, 93s.; or, *Popular Edition*, 7 Vols. Post 8vo, 42s.

From the First Invasion by the Romans, down to the 14th year of Queen Victoria's Reign. By MRS. MARKHAM. 68th Thousand. Woodcuts. 12mo. 6s.

As it is: Social, Political, and Industrial, in the Middle of the 19th Century. By W. JOHNSTON. 2 Vols. Post 8vo. 18s.

and 'France under the House of Lancaster. With an Introductory View of the Early Reformation. 8vo. 15s.

ERSKINE'S (CAPT., R.N.) Journal of a Cruise among the Islands of the Western Pacific, including the Feejees and others inhabited by the Polynesian Negro Races. Plates. 8vo. 16s.

ESKIMAUX (THE) and English Vocabulary, for the use of Travellers in the Arctic Regions. 16mo. 3s. 6d.

ESSAYS FROM "THE TIMES." Being a Selection from the LITERARY PAPERS which have appeared in that Journal. 6th Thousand. 2 vols. Fcap. 8vo. 8s.

ENGLISHWOMAN IN RUSSIA: or, Impressions of Manners and Society during a Ten Years' Residence in that Country. Woodcuts. Post 8vo. 10s 6d.

EXETER'S (BISHOP OF) Letters to the late Charles Butler, on the Theological parts of his Book of the Roman Catholic Church; with Remarks on certain Works of Dr. Milner and Dr. Lingard, and on some parts of the Evidence of Dr. Doyle. Second Edition. 8vo. 16s.

FAIRY RING (THE), A Collection of TALES and STORIES for Young Persons. From the German. By J. E. TAYLOR. Illustrated by RICHARD DOYLE. Second Edition. Fcap. 8vo.

FALKNER'S (FRED.) Muck Manual for the Use of Farmers. A Treatise on the Nature and Value of Manures. Second Edition, with a Glossary of Terms and an Index. Fcap. 8vo. 5s.

FAMILY RECEIPT-BOOK. A Collection of a Thousand Valuable and Useful Receipts. Fcap. 8vo. 5s. 6d.

FANCOURT'S (COL.) History of Yucatan, from its Discovery to the Close of the 17th Century. With Map. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

FARINI'S (LUIGI CARLO) History of the Roman State, 1815-50. Translated from the Italian. By Right Hon. W. E. GLADSTONE. Vols. 3 & 4. 8vo. 12s. each.

FEATHERSTONHAUGH'S (G. W.) Tour through the Slave States of North America, from the River-Potomac, to Texas and the Frontiers of Mexico. Plates. 2 Vols. 8vo. 26s.

FELLOWS' (SIR CHARLES) Travels and Researches in Asia Minor, more particularly in the Province of Lycia. New Edition. Plates. Post 8vo. 9s.

FERGUSON'S (ROBERT, M.D.) Essays on the Diseases of Women. Part I. Puerperal Fever. Post 8vo. 9s. 6d.

FERGUSON'S (JAMES) Palaces of Nineveh and Persepolis Restored: an Essay on Ancient Assyrian and Persian Architecture. With 45 Woodcuts. 8vo. 16s.

Peril of Portsmouth; or French Fleets and English Forts. Third Edition. Plan. 8vo. 3s.

Handbook of Architecture. Being a Concise and Popular Account of the Different Styles prevailing in all Ages and Countries in the World. With a Description of the most remarkable Buildings. With 1000 Illustrations. 8vo. In the Press.

FEUERBACH'S Remarkable German Crimes and Trials. Translated from the German by Lady DUFF GORDON. 8vo. 12s.

FISHER'S (REV. GEORGE) Elements of Geometry, for the Use of Schools. *Third Edition.* 18mo. 3s.

— First Principles of Algebra, for the Use of Schools. *Third Edition.* 18mo. 3s.

FISHLAKE'S (REV. J. R.) Translation of Buttman's Lexilogus; A Critical Examination of the Meaning and Etymology of numerous Greek Words and Passages, intended principally for Homer and Hesiod. With Explanatory Notes and Copious Indexes. *Third Edition.* 8vo. 14s.

— Translation of Buttman's Catalogue of Irregular Greek Verbs; with all the Tenses extant—their Formation, Meaning, and Usage. With Explanatory Notes, and accompanied by an Index. *Second Edition.* 8vo. 7s. 6d.

FLOWER GARDEN (THE). An Essay reprinted from the "Quarterly Review." Fcap. 8vo. 1s.

FORD'S (RICHARD) Handbook for Spain, Andalusia, Ronda, Valencia, Catalonia, Granada, Galicia, Arragon, Navarre, &c. *Third and entirely Revised Edition.* 2 Vols. Post 8vo.

— Gatherings from Spain. Post 8vo. 6s.

FORSYTH'S (WILLIAM) Hortensius, or the Advocate: an Historical Essay on the Office and Duties of an Advocate. Post 8vo. 12s.

— History of Napoleon at St. Helena. From the Letters and Journals of SIR HUDSON LOWE. Portrait and Maps. 3 Vols. 8vo. 45s.

FORTUNE'S (ROBERT) Narrative of Two Visits to China, between the years 1843-52, with full Descriptions of the Culture of the Tea Plant. *Third Edition.* Woodcuts. 2 Vols. Post 8vo. 18s.

FRANCE (HISTORY OF). From the Conquest by the Gauls to the Death of Louis Philippe. By Mrs. MARKHAM. 30th Thousand. Woodcuts. 12mo. 6s.

FRENCH (THE) in Algiers; The Soldier of the Foreign Legion—and the Prisoners of Abd-el-Kadir. Translated by Lady DUFF GORDON. Post 8vo. 2s. 6d.

GALTON'S (FRANÇOIS) Art of Travel; or, Hints on the Shifts and Contrivances available in Wild Countries. Woodcuts. Post 8vo. 6s.

GEOGRAPHICAL (THE) Journal. Published by the Royal Geographical Society of London. 8vo.

GERMANY (HISTORY OF). From the Invasion by Marius, to the present time. On the plan of Mrs. MARKHAM. 6th Thousand. Woodcuts. 12mo. 6s.

GIBBON'S (EDWARD) Life and Correspondence. By DEAN MILMAN. Portrait. 8vo. 9s.

— Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire. *A New Edition.* Preceded by the Autobiography of GIBBON. Edited with Notes by Dr. WM. SMITH. Portrait and Maps. 8 Vols. 8vo. 60s.

GIFFARD'S (EDWARD) Deeds of Naval Daring; or, Anecdotes of the British Navy. 2 Vols. Fcap. 8vo. 5s.

GISBORNE'S (THOMAS) Essays on Agriculture. *Third Edition.* Post 8vo. 5s.

GLADSTONE'S (RIGHT HON. W. E.) Prayers arranged from the Liturgy for Family Use. *Second Edition.* 12mo. 2s. 6d.

History of the Roman State. Translated from the Italian of LUIGI CARLO FARINI. Vols. 3 and 4. 8vo. 12s. each.

GOLDSMITH'S (OLIVER) Works. A New Edition. Printed from the last editions revised by the Author. Edited by PETER CUNNINGHAM. Vignettes. 4 Vols. 8vo. 30s.

GLEIG'S (REV. G. R.) Campaigns of the British Army at Washington and New Orleans. Post 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Story of the Battle of Waterloo. Compiled from Public and Authentic Sources. Post 8vo. 5s.

Narrative of Sir Robert Sale's Brigade in Afghanistan, with an Account of the Seizure and Defence of Jellalabad. Post 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Life of Robert Lord Clive. Post 8vo. 5s.

Life and Letters of General Sir Thomas Munro. Post 8vo. 5s.

GOOCH (ROBERT, M.D.), On the most Important Diseases peculiar to Women. *Second Edition.* 8vo. 12s.

GORDON'S (SIR ALEX. DUFF) Sketches of German Life, and Scenes from the War of Liberation. From the German. Post 8vo. 5s.

(LADY DUFF), Amber-Witch: the most interesting Trial for Witchcraft ever known. From the German. Post 8vo. 2s. 6d.

French in Algiers. 1. The Soldier of the Foreign Legion. 2. The Prisoners of Abd-el-Kadir. From the French. Post 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Remarkable German Crimes and Trials. From the German. 8vo. 12s.

GOSPEL STORIES FOR CHILDREN. An Attempt to render the Chief Events of the Life of Our Saviour intelligible and profitable. *Second Edition.* 18mo. 3s. 6d.

GRANTS (ASAHEL), Nestorians, or the Lost Tribes; containing Evidence of their Identity, their Manners, Customs, and Ceremonies; with Sketches of Travel in Ancient Assyria, Armenia, and Mesopotamia; and Illustrations of Scripture Prophecy. *Third Edition.* Fcap. 8vo. 6s.

GRENVILLE (THE) LETTERS AND DIARIES; being the Public and Private Correspondence of George Grenville, his Friends and Contemporaries, during a period of 30 years.—Including his DIARY OF POLITICAL EVENTS, while First Lord of the Treasury. Edited, with Notes, by W. J. SMITH. 4 Vols. 8vo. 16s. each.

GREEK GRAMMAR FOR SCHOOLS. Abridged from Matthiæ. By the BISHOP OF LONDON. *Eighth Edition*, revised by Rev. J. EDWARDS. 12mo. 3s.

Accidence for Schools. Abridged from Matthiæ. By the BISHOP OF LONDON. *Fourth Edition*, revised by Rev. J. EDWARDS. 12mo. 2s.

GREY'S (SIR GEORGE) Polynesian Mythology, and Ancient Traditional History of the New Zealand Race. Woodcuts. Post 8vo. 10s. 6d.

GRÖTE'S (GEORGE) History of Greece. From the Earliest Period to the death of Alexander the Great. Maps. 12 vols. 8vo. 16s. each. *The Work may be had as follows:—*

Vols. I.—II.—Legendary Greece. Grecian History to the Reign of Peisistratus at Athens.

Vols. III.—IV.—History of Early Athens, and the Legislation of Solon. Grecian Colonies. View of the Contemporary Nations surrounding Greece. Grecian History down to the first Persian Invasion, and the Battle of Marathon.

Vols. V.—VI.—Persian War and Invasion of Greece by Xerxes. Period between the Persian and the Peloponnesian Wars. Peloponnesian War down to the Expedition of the Athenians against Syracuse.

Vols. VII.—VIII.—The Peace of Nikias down to the Battle of Knidus. Socrates and the Sophists.

Vols. IX.—XI.—From the Restoration of the Democracy at Athens down to the Death of Philip of Macedon (n.c. 403—359).

Vol. XII.—The end of the Reign of Alexander the Great. Review of Plato and Aristotle.

GUIZOT (M.), on the Causes of the Success of the English Revolution of 1640-1688. 8vo. 6s.; or *Cheap Edition*, 12mo, 1s.

— Democracy in France. *Sixth Edition*. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

GURWOOD'S (COL.) Despatches of the Duke of Wellington during his various Campaigns. Compiled from Official and Authentic Documents. *New, enlarged, and complete Edition*. 8 vols. 8vo. 21s. each.

— Selections from the Wellington Despatches and General Orders. *New Edition*. 8vo. 18s.

— Speeches in Parliament of the Duke of Wellington. 2 Vols. 8vo. 42s.

GUSTAVUS VASA (History of), King of Sweden. With Extracts from his Correspondence. Portrait. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

HALLAM'S (HENRY) Constitutional History of England, from the Accession of Henry the Seventh to the Death of George the Second. *Seventh Edition*. 3 Vols. 8vo. 30s.

— History of Europe during the Middle Ages. *Tenth Edition*. 3 Vols. 8vo. 30s.

— Introduction to the Literary History of Europe, during the 16th, 17th, and 18th Centuries. *Fourth Edition*. 3 Vols. 8vo. 86s.

— Literary Essays and Characters. Selected from the last work. Fcap. 8vo. 2s.

HAMILTON'S (WALTER) Hindostan, Geographically, Statistically, and Historically. Map. 2 Vols. 4to. 94s. 6d.

— (W. J.) Researches in Asia Minor, Pontus, and Armenia; with some Account of the Antiquities and Geology of those Countries. Plates. 2 Vols. 8vo. 38s.

HAMPDEN'S (BISHOP) Essay on the Philosophical Evidence of Christianity, or the Credibility obtained to a Scripture Revelation from its Coincidence with the Facts of Nature. 8vo. 9s. 8d.

HARCOURT'S (EDWARD VERNON) Sketch of Madeira; with Map and Plates. Post 8vo. 8s. 6d.

HART'S ARMY LIST. (*Published Quarterly and Annually.*) 8vo.

HAY'S (J. H. DRUMMOND) Western Barbary, its wild Tribes and savage Animals. Post 8vo. 2s. 6d.

HAND-BOOK OF TRAVEL-TALK; or, Conversations in
English, German, French, and Italian. 18mo. 3s. 6d.

— **BELGIUM AND THE RHINE.** Maps. Post 8vo. 5s.

— **NORTH GERMANY—HOLLAND, BELGIUM, and**
the Rhine to Switzerland. Map. Post 8vo. 9s.

— **SOUTH GERMANY—Bavaria, Austria, Salzberg,**
the Austrian and Bavarian Alps, the Tyrol, and the Danube, from Ulm
to the Black Sea. Map. Post 8vo. 9s.

— **SWITZERLAND—the Alps of Savoy, and Piedmont.**
Maps. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d.

— **OF FRANCE—Normandy, Brittany, the French**
Alps, the Rivers Loire, Seine, Rhone, and Garonne, Dauphiné, Provence,
and the Pyrenees. Maps. Post 8vo. 9s.

— **SPAIN—Andalusia, Ronda, Granada, Valencia,**
Catalonia, Galicia, Arragon, and Navarre. Maps. 2 Vols. Post 8vo.

— **PORTUGAL.** Map. Post 8vo.

— **PAINTING—the German, Dutch, Spanish, and**
French Schools. From the German of KUGLER. Edited by SIR
EDMUND HEAD. Woodcuts. 2 Vols. Post 8vo.

— **NORTH ITALY—Florence, Sardinia, Genoa, the**
Riviera, Venice, Lombardy, and Tuscany. Map. Post 8vo. 9s.

— **CENTRAL ITALY—SOUTH TUSCANY and the**
PAPAL STATES. Map. Post 8vo. 7s.

— **ROME—AND ITS ENVIRONS.** Map. Post
8vo. 7s.

— **SOUTH ITALY—Naples, Pompeii, Herculaneum,**
Vesuvius, &c. Map. Post 8vo. 15s.

— **PAINTING—the Italian Schools.** From the Ger-
man of KUGLER. Edited by SIR CHARLES EASTLAKE. Woodcuts. 2
Vols. Post 8vo.

— **PICTURE GALLERIES OF ITALY.** Being a
Biographical Dictionary of Italian Painters: with a Table of the Con-
temporary Schools. By a LADY. Edited by RALPH N. WORNUM.
Post 8vo. 6s. 6d.

— **GREECE—the Ionian Islands, Albania, Thessaly,**
and Macedonia. Maps. Post 8vo. 15s.

— **TURKEY—MALTA, ASIA MINOR, CONSTANTINOPLE,**
Armenia, Mesopotamia, &c. Maps. Post 8vo. 10s.

— **EGYPT—Thebes, the Nile, Alexandria, Cairo,**
the Pyramids, Mount Sinai, &c. Map. Post 8vo. 15s.

— **DENMARK—NORWAY and SWEDEN.** Maps. Post
8vo. 12s.

— **RUSSIA—THE BALTIC AND FINLAND.** Maps. Post
8vo. 12s.

— **DEVON AND CORNWALL.** Maps. Post 8vo. 6s.

— **LONDON, PAST AND PRESENT.** Being an Alpha-
betical Account of all the Antiquities, Curiosities, Churches, Works
of Art, Places, and Streets connected with Interesting and Historical
Associations. Post 8vo. 16s.

HAND-BOOK OF MODERN LONDON. A Guide to all objects of interest in the Metropolis. Map. 16mo. 5s.

— **ENVIRONS OF LONDON.** Including a Circle of 30 Miles round St. Paul's. Maps. Post 8vo. (*Nearly ready.*)

— **BRITISH MUSEUM; ITS ANTIQUITIES AND SCULPTURE.** 300 Woodcuts. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d.

— **PICTURE GALLERIES IN AND NEAR LONDON.** With Critical Notices. Post 8vo. 10s.

— **WESTMINSTER ABBEY**—its Art, Architecture, and Associations. Woodcuts. 16mo. 1s.

— **HISTORY,** Alphabetically arranged. 8vo. (*Nearly Ready.*)

— **(OFFICIAL).** Giving an Historical Account of the Duties attached to the various Civil and Ecclesiastical Departments of the Government. Post 8vo. 6s.

— **FAMILIAR QUOTATIONS.** Chiefly from English Authors. A New Edition with an Index. Fcap. 8vo. 5s.

— **ARCHITECTURE.** Being a Concise and Popular Account of the Different Styles prevailing in all Ages and Countries in the World. With a Description of the most remarkable Buildings. By JAMES FERGOUSON. Illustrations. 8vo. *In the Press.*

— **CATHEDRALS OF ENGLAND.** With Plates. Post 8vo. *In Preparation.*

— **MEDIEVAL ART.** Translated from the French of M. Jules Labarthe, and Edited by Mrs. PALLISER. With Illustrations. 8vo. *In the Press.*

HEAD'S (SIR FRANCIS) Rough Notes of some Rapid Journeys across the Pampas and over the Andes. Post 8vo. 2s. 6d.

— **Bubbles from the Brunnen of Nassau.** By an OLD MAN. Sixth Edition. 16mo. 5s.

— **Emigrant.** Sixth Edition. Fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

— **Stokers and Pokers, or the London and North-Western Railway.** Post 8vo. 2s. 6d.

— **Defenceless State of Great Britain.** Contents—1. Military Warfare. 2. Naval Warfare. 3. The Invasion of England. 4. The Capture of London by a French Army. 5. The Treatment of Women in War. 6. How to Defend Great Britain. Post 8vo. 12s.

— **Faggot of French Sticks, or description of Paris in 1851.** 2 Vols. Post 8vo. 24s.

— **Fortnight in Ireland.** Second Edition. Map. 8vo. 12s.

— **(SIR GEORGE)** Forest Scenes and Incidents in Canada. Second Edition. Post 8vo. 10s.

— **Home Tour through the Manufacturing Districts of England, Scotland, and Ireland, including the Channel Islands, and the Isle of Man.** Third Edition. 2 Vols. Post 8vo. 12s.

HEAD'S (SIR EDMUND) Handbook of Painting—the German, Dutch, Spanish and French Schools. Partly from the German of KUGLER. With Illustrations. 2 Vols. Post 8vo. 24s.

HEBER'S (BISHOP) Parish Sermons; on the Lessons, the Gospel, or the Epistle, for every Sunday in the Year, and for Week-day Festivals. *Sixth Edition.* 2 Vols. Post 8vo. 16s.

——— Sermons Preached in England. *Second Edition.* 8vo. 3s. 6d.

——— Hymns written and adapted for the weekly Church Service of the Year. *Twelfth Edition.* 16mo. 2s.

——— Poetical Works. *Fifth Edition.* Portrait. Fcap. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

——— (BISHOP) Journey through the Upper Provinces of India. From Calcutta to Bombay, with a Journey to Madras and the Southern Provinces. 2 Vols. Post 8vo. 10s.

HEIRESS (THE) in Her Minority; or, The Progress of Character. By the Author of "BERTHA'S JOURNAL." 2 Vols. 12mo. 18s.

HERODOTUS. A New English Version. Translated from the Text of GAISFORD, and Edited with Notes, illustrating the History and Geography of Herodotus, from the most recent sources of information. By Rev. G. RAWLINSON, COLONEL RAWLINSON, and SIR J. G. WILKINSON. 4 Vols. 8vo. *In Preparation.*

HERSCHEL'S (SIR J. W. F.) Manual of Scientific Enquiry, for the Use of Travellers. By various Writers. *Second Edition.* Post 8vo. 10s. 6d.

HERVEY'S (LORD) Memoirs of the Reign of George the Second, from his Accession to the Death of Queen Caroline. Edited, with Notes, by Right Hon. J. W. CROKER. *Second and Cheaper Edition.* Portrait. 2 Vols. 8vo. 21s.

HICKMAN'S (WM.) Treatise on the Law and Practice of Naval Courts Martial. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

HILL (FREDERIO) On Crime: its Amount, Causes, and Remedies. 8vo. 12s.

HILLARD'S (G. S.) Six Months in Italy. 2 Vols. Post 8vo. 16s.

HISTORY OF ENGLAND AND FRANCE UNDER THE HOUSE OF LANCASTER. With an Introductory View of the Early Reformation. 8vo. 15s.

——— the late War: with Sketches of Nelson, Wellington, and Napoleon. By J. G. LOCKHART. 18mo. 2s. 6d.

HOLLAND'S (REV. W. B.) Psalms and Hymns, selected and adapted to the various Solemnities of the Church. *Third Edition.* 24mo. 1s. 3d.

HOLLWAY'S (J. G.) Month in Norway. Fcap. 8vo. 2s.

HONEY BEE (THE). An Essay by a Clergyman. Reprinted from the "Quarterly Review." Fcap. 8vo. 1s.

HOME AND COLONIAL LIBRARY. Complete in 76 Parts.
 Post 8vo, or bound in 37 Volumes, cloth.

CONTENTS OF THE SERIES.

- THE BIBLE IN SPAIN. By GEORGE BORROW.
 JOURNALS IN INDIA. By BISHOP HEDER.
 TRAVELS IN THE HOLY LAND. By CAPTAINS INBY and MANGLES.
 THE SIEGE OF GIBRALTAR. By JOHN DRINKWATER.
 MOROCCO AND THE MOORS. By J. DRUMMOND HAY.
 LETTERS FROM THE BALTIC. By a LADY.
 THE AMBER WITCH. By LADY DUFF GORDON.
 OLIVER CROMWELL & JOHN BUNYAN. By ROBERT SOUTHEY.
 NEW SOUTH WALES. By MRS. MEREDITH.
 LIFE OF SIR FRANCIS DRAKE. By JOHN BARROW.
 FATHER RIPA'S MEMOIRS OF THE COURT OF CHINA.
 A RESIDENCE IN THE WEST INDIES. By M. G. LEWIS.
 SKETCHES OF PERSIA. By SIR JOHN MALCOLM.
 THE FRENCH IN ALGIERS. By LADY DUFF GORDON.
 BRACEBRIDGE HALL. By WASHINGTON IRVING.
 VOYAGE OF A NATURALIST. By CHARLES DARWIN.
 HISTORY OF THE FALL OF THE JESUITS.
 LIFE OF LOUIS PRINCE OF CONDE. By LORD MAHON.
 GIPSIES OF SPAIN. By GEORGE BORROW.
 THE MARQUESAS. By HERMANN MELVILLE.
 LIVONIAN TALES. By a Lady.
 MISSIONARY LIFE IN CANADA. By REV. J. ABBOTT.
 SALE'S BRIGADE IN AFGHANISTAN. By REV. G. R. GLEIG.
 LETTERS FROM MADRAS. By a Lady.
 HIGHLAND SPORTS. By CHARLES ST. JOHN.
 JOURNEYS ACROSS THE PAMPAS. By SIR F. B. HEAD.
 GATHERINGS FROM SPAIN. By RICHARD FORD.
 SIEGES OF VIENNA BY THE TURKS. By LORD ELLENBORO.
 SKETCHES OF GERMAN LIFE. By SIR A. GORDON.
 ADVENTURES IN THE SOUTH SEAS. By HERMANN MELVILLE.
 STORY OF BATTLE OF WATERLOO. By REV. G. R. GLEIG.
 A VOYAGE UP THE RIVER AMAZON. By W. H. EDWARDS.
 THE WAYSIDE CROSS. By CAPT. MILMAN.
 MANNERS & CUSTOMS OF INDIA. By REV. C. ACLAND.
 CAMPAIGNS AT WASHINGTON. By REV. G. R. GLEIG.
 ADVENTURES IN MEXICO. By G. F. RUXTON.
 PORTUGAL AND GALLICIA. By LORD CARNARVON.
 LIFE OF LORD CLIVE. By REV. G. R. GLEIG.
 BUSH LIFE IN AUSTRALIA. By H. W. HAYGARTH.
 THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF HENRY STEFFENS.
 TALES OF A TRAVELLER. By WASHINGTON IRVING.
 SHORT LIVES OF THE POETS. By THOMAS CAMPBELL.
 HISTORICAL ESSAYS. By LORD MAHON.
 LONDON & NORTH-WESTERN RAILWAY. By SIR F. B. HEAD.
 ADVENTURES IN THE LYBIAN DESERT. By BAYLE ST. JOHN.
 A RESIDENCE AT SIERRA LEONE. By a Lady.
 LIFE OF GENERAL MUNRO. By REV. G. R. GLEIG.
 MEMOIRS OF SIR FOWELL BUXTON. By his SON.
 LIFE OF OLIVER GOLDSMITH. By WASHINGTON IRVING.

HOOK'S (REV. DR.) Church Dictionary. *Seventh Edition.* 8vo. 16s.

— Discourses on the Religious Controversies of the Day. 8vo. 9s.

— Advice to the Roman Catholics. By DEAN COMBER. A New Edition. With Notes. Fcap. 8vo. 3s.

— (THEODORE) Life. An Essay. Reprinted from the "Quarterly Review." Fcap. 8vo. 1s.

HOOKE'S (J. D.) Himalayan Journals; or, Notes of an Oriental Naturalist in Bengal, the Sikkim and Nepal Himalayas, the Khasia Mountains, &c. *Second Edition.* Woodcuts. 2 vols. Post 8vo.

HOOPER'S (LIEUT.) Ten Months among the Tents of the Tuski; with Incidents of an Arctic Boat Expedition in Search of Sir John Franklin. By LIEUT. HOOPER, R.N. Plates 8vo. 14s.

HORACE (Works of). Edited by DEAN MILMAN. *New Edition.* With 300 Woodcuts. Crown 8vo. 21s.

— (Life of). By DEAN MILMAN. *New Edition.* Woodcuts, and coloured Borders. 8vo. 9s.

HORNER'S (FRANÇOIS) Memoirs and Letters. By his BROTHER. *Second Edition.* Portrait. 2 Vols. 8vo. 30s.

HOSPITALS AND SISTERHOODS. *Second Edition.* Fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

HOUSTOUN'S (MRS.) Yacht Voyage to Texas and the Gulf of Mexico. Plates. 2 Vols. Post 8vo. 21s.

HUMBOLDT'S (ALEX.) Cosmos; or, a Physical Description of the World. Translated by COL. and MRS. SABINE. *Seventh Edition.* 3 Vols. Post 8vo. 10s. 6d.

— Aspects of Nature in different Lands and in different Climates. Translated by COL. and MRS. SABINE. 2 Vols. Post 8vo. 6s.

HUTCHINSON (COLONEL) on Dog-Breaking; the most expeditious, certain, and easy Method, whether great Excellence or only Mediocrity be required. *Second Edition.* Woodcuts. Fcap. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

INKERSLEY'S (THOS.) Gothic Architecture in France; Being an Inquiry into the Chronological Succession of the Romanesque and Pointed Styles; with Notices of some of the principal Buildings, and an Index. 8vo. 12s.

IRBY AND MANGLES' Travels in Egypt, Nubia, Syria, and the Holy Land, including a Journey round the Dead Sea, and through the Country east of the Jordan. Post 8vo. 2s. 6d.

JAMES' (REV. THOMAS) Fables of Æsop. A New Version, chiefly from the Original Greek. With 100 Original Designs, by JOHN TENNIEL. Post 8vo. 2s. 6d.

JAMESON'S (MRS.) Handbook to the Picture Galleries in and near London. With Historical, Biographical, and Critical Notices. Post 8vo. *Second Edition.* 10s.

JAPAN AND THE JAPANESE. Described from the Accounts of Recent Dutch Travellers. *New Edition.* Post 8vo. 6s.

JERVIS'S (LIEUT.) Manual of Operations in the Field, for the Use of Officers. Post 8vo. 9s. 6d.

- JESSE'S** (EDWARD) Visits to Spots of Interest in the Vicinity of Windsor and Eton. Woodcuts. Post 8vo. 12s.
- Scenes and Occupations of Country Life. With Recollections of Natural History. *Third Edition.* Woodcuts. Fcap. 8vo. 8s.
- Gleanings in Natural History. With Anecdotes of the Sagacity and Instinct of Animals. *Sixth Edition.* Fcap. 8vo. 8s.
- JOCELYN'S** (LORD) Six Months with the Chinese Expedition; or, Leaves from a Soldier's Note-Book. *Seventh Edition.* Fcap. 8vo. 5s. 6d.
- JOHNSON'S** (DR. SAMUEL) Life: By James Boswell. Including the Tour to the Hebrides, with Notes by Sir W. Scott. Edited by the Right Hon. JOHN WILSON CROKER. *A New Edition,* with much additional matter. 1 Vol. Portraits. Royal 8vo. 15s.
- Lives of the most eminent English Poets. A New Edition. Edited and annotated. By PETER CUNNINGHAM. 3 vols. 8vo. 22s. 6d.
- JOHNSTON'S** (WM.) England as it is: Social, Political, and Industrial, in the Middle of the 19th Century. 2 Vols. Post 8vo. 18s.
- JONES'S** (REV. RICHARD) Essay on the Distribution of Wealth, and on the Sources of Taxation. Part I.—RENT. *Second Edition.* Post 8vo. 7s. 6d.
- JOURNAL OF A NATURALIST.** *Fourth Edition.* Woodcuts. Post 8vo. 9s. 6d.
- JOWETT'S** (REV. B.) Commentary on St. Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians, Galatians, and Romans. With Notes and Dissertations. 8vo. *In the Press.*
- KEN'S** (BISHOP) Life. By A LAYMAN. *Second Edition.* Portrait. 2 Vols. 8vo. 18s.
- Exposition of the Apostles Creed. Extracted from his "Practice of Divine Love." *New Edition.* Fcap. 1s. 6d.
- Approach to the Holy Altar. Extracted from his "Manual of Prayer" and "Practice of Divine Love." *New Edition.* Fcap. 8vo or 24mo. 1s. 6d. each.
- KING** EDWARD VERN'S Latin Grammar; or, an Introduction to the Latin Tongue, for the Use of Schools. *Tenth Edition.* 12mo. 3s. 6d.
- First Latin Book, or the Accidence, Syntax and Prosody, with an English Translation for the Use of Junior Classes. *Second Edition.* 12mo. 2s.
- KINNEAR'S** (JOHN G.) Cairo, Petra, and Damascus, described from Notes made during a Tour in those Countries: with Remarks on the Government of Mehemet Ali, and on the present prospects of Syria. Post 8vo. 5s. 6d.
- KNIGHT'S** (CHARLES) Knowledge is Power: a View of the Productive forces of Modern Society, and the results of Labour, Capital and Skill. Woodcuts. Fcap. 8vo. 7s. 6d.
- Once upon a Time. 2 Vols. Fcap. 8vo. 10s.
- Old Printer and Modern Press. Woodcuts. Fcap. 8vo. 5s.
- KOCH'S** (PROFESSOR) Crimea and Odessa; their Climate and Resources, described from personal knowledge. Map. Post 8vo.

KUGLER'S (DR. FRANZ) Handbook to the History of Painting (the Italian Schools). Translated from the German. Edited, with Notes, by SIR CHARLES EASTLAKE. *Third Edition.* With Woodcuts from the Old Masters. 2 Vols. Post 8vo. 24s.

———— (the German, Dutch, Spanish, and French Schools). Partly Translated from the German. Edited, with Notes, by SIR EDMUND HEAD, Bart. With Woodcuts from the Old Masters. 2 Vols. Post 8vo. 24s.

LABARTHE'S (M. JULES) Handbook of Mediæval Art. Translated from the French of M. JULES LABARTHE, and edited with notes and illustrations, by MRS. FALLESER. Woodcuts. 8vo.

LABORDE'S (LEON DE) Journey through Arabia Petrea, to Mount Sinai, and the Excavated City of Petrea,—the Edom of the Prophecies. *Second Edition.* With Plates. 8vo. 18s.

LAMBERT'S (MISS) Church Needlework. With Practical Remarks on its Preparation and Arrangement. Plates. Post 8vo. 9s. 6d.

———— My Knitting Book. Woodcuts. *Two Parts.* 16mo. 3s.

———— My Crochet Sampler. Woodcuts. *Two Parts.* 16mo. 4s.

———— Hints on Decorative Needlework. 16mo. 1s. 6d.

LANE'S (E. W.) Arabian Nights. Translated with Explanatory Notes. With Woodcuts. Royal 8vo. 21s.

LATIN GRAMMAR (KING EDWARD THE VIth's.) For the Use of Schools. *Eighth Edition.* 12mo. 3s. 6d.

———— First Book (KING EDWARD VI.); or, the Accidence, Syntax, and Prosody, with English Translation for Junior Classes. *Second Edition.* 12mo. 2s.

LAYARD'S (AUSTEN H.) Nineveh and its Remains. Being a Narrative of Researches and Discoveries amidst the Ruins of Assyria. With an Account of the Chaldean Christians of Kurdistan; the Yezedis, or Devil-worshippers; and an Enquiry into the Manners and Arts of the Ancient Assyrians. *Sixth Edition.* Plates and Woodcuts. 2 Vols. 8vo. 36s.

———— Nineveh and Babylon; being the Result of a Second Expedition to Assyria. *Fourteenth Thousand.* Plates and Woodcuts. 8vo. 21s. Or Fine Paper. 2 Vols. 8vo. 30s.

———— Popular Account of Nineveh. *15th Edition.* With Woodcuts. Post 8vo. 5s.

———— Monuments of Nineveh. Illustrated by One Hundred Engravings. Imperial Folio, 10l. 10s.

———— Second Series. Illustrated by Seventy Plates. Imperial Folio. 10l. 10s.

LEAKE'S (COL. W. MARTIN) Topography of Athens, with Remarks on its Antiquities; to which is added, the Demi of Attica. *Second Edition.* Plates. 2 Vols. 8vo. 30s.

———— Travels in Northern Greece. Maps. 4 Vols. 8vo. 60s.

———— Greece at the End of Twenty-three Years Protection. 8vo. 6d.

———— Peloponnesiaca: A Supplement to Travels in the Morea. 8vo. 15s.

———— Thoughts on the Degradation of Science in England. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

LESLIE'S (C. R.) Handbook for Young Painters. With Illustrations. Post 3vo. 10s. 6d.

LETTERS FROM THE SHORES OF THE BALTIC. By a LADY. Post 8vo. 2s. 6d.

———— Madras; or, First Impressions of Life and Manners in India. By a LADY. Post 8vo. 2s. 6d.

———— Sierra Leone, written to Friends at Home. By a LADY. Edited by Mrs. NORTON. Post 8vo. 5s.

LEWIS' (G. CORNEWALL) Essay on the Government of Dependencies. 8vo. 12s.

———— Glossary of Provincial Words used in Herefordshire and some of the adjoining Counties. 12mo. 4s. 6d.

———— Essay on the Origin and Formation of the Romance Languages: *Second Edition*. 8vo. 12s.

———— (LADY THERESA) Friends and Contemporaries of the Lord Chancellor Clarendon, illustrative of Portraits in his Gallery. With an Introduction, containing a Descriptive Catalogue of the Pictures, and an Account of the Origin of the Collection. Portraits. 3 Vols. 8vo. 42s.

———— (M. G.) Journal of a Residence among the Negroes in the West Indies. Post 8vo. 2s. 6d.

LEXINGTON (THE) PAPERS; or, Some Account of the Courts of London and Vienna at the end of the 17th Century. Extracted from Official and Private Correspondence, 1694-1698. Edited by HON. H. MANNERS SUTTON. 8vo. 14s.

LIDDELL'S (H. G.) History of the Republic of Rome. From the close of the Second Punic War to the death of Sylla. 2 Vols. 8vo. *In Preparation*.

———— School History of Rome. From the Earliest Times to the Establishment of the Empire. Woodcuts. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d.

LINDSAY'S (LORD) Sketches of the History of Christian Art. 3 Vols. 8vo. 31s. 6d.

———— Lives of the Lindsays; or, a Memoir of the Houses of Crawford and Balcarres. To which are added, Extracts from the Official Correspondence of Alexander, sixth Earl of Balcarres, during the Maroon War; together with Personal Narratives, by his Brothers, the Hon. Robert, Colin, James, John, and Hugh Lindsay; and by his Sister, Lady Anne Earnard. 3 Vols. 8vo. 42s.

———— Progression by Antagonism. A Theory, involving Considerations touching the Present Position, Duties, and Destiny of Great Britain. 8vo. 6s.

———— (REV. HENRY) Practical Lectures on the Historical Books of the Old Testament. 2 Vols. 16mo. 10s.

LITTLE ARTHUR'S HISTORY OF ENGLAND. By LADY CALLCOTT. *Seventeenth Edition*. 18mo. 2s. 6d.

LIVONIAN TALES.—The Disponent.—The Wolves.—The Jewess. By the Author of "Letters from the Baltic." Post 8vo. 2s. 6d.

LOCKHART'S (J. G.) Ancient Spanish Ballads. *New Edition*, with Illuminated Titles, Borders, &c. 4to. Or *Cheap Edition*. Post 8vo. 2s. 6d.

———— Life of Robert Burns. *Fifth Edition*. Fcap. 8vo. 3s.

———— History of the Late War: with Sketches of Nelson, Wellington, and Napoleon. 18mo. 2s. 6d.

LOUDON'S (Mrs.) Ladies' Gardener; or, Instructions in Gardening.
With Directions for Every Month in the Year, and a Calendar of
Operations. *Eighth Edition.* Woodcuts. Fcap. 8vo. 5s.

— **Modern Botany for Ladies; or, a Popular Introduction**
to the Natural System of Plants. *Second Edition.* Woodcuts. Fcap. 8vo. 6s.

LOWE'S (Sir HUDSON) Letters and Journals, during the Captivity
of Napoleon at St. Helena. By WILLIAM FORSYTH. Portrait. 3 Vols.
8vo. 45s.

LYELL'S (Sir CHARLES) Principles of Geology; or, the Modern
Changes of the Earth and its Inhabitants considered as illustrative of
Geology. *Ninth Edition.* Woodcuts. 8vo. 18s.

— **Manual of Elementary Geology; or, the Ancient Changes**
of the Earth and its Inhabitants illustrated by its Geological Monuments.
Fifth Edition. Woodcuts. 8vo.

— **Travels in North America, 1841-2; with Observations on**
the United States, Canada, and Nova Scotia. Plates. 2 Vols. Post 8vo.

— **Second Visit to the United States of North America,**
1845-6. 2 Vols. Post 8vo.

MAHON'S (Lord) History of England, from the Peace of Utrecht
to the Peace of Versailles, 1713-63. *Third Edition.* 7 Vols. 8vo.
83s.; or, *Popular Edition.* 7 Vols. Post 8vo. 42s.

— **"Forty-Five;" or, a Narrative of the Rebellion in**
Scotland. Post 8vo. 3s.

— **History of the War of the Succession in Spain. *Second***
Edition. Map. 8vo. 15s.

— **Spain under Charles the Second; or, Extracts from the**
Correspondence of the Hon. ALEXANDER STANHOPE, British Minister at
Madrid from 1690 to 1700. *Second Edition.* Post 8vo. 6s. 6d.

— **Life of Louis Prince of Condé, surnamed the Great.**
Post 8vo. 6s.

— **Life of Belisarius. *Second Edition.* Post 8vo. 10s. 6d.**

— **Historical and Critical Essays. Post 8vo. 5s.**

— **Story of Joan of Arc. Fcap. 8vo. 1s.**

M'CULLOCH'S (J. R.); Collected Edition of RICARDO'S Political
Works. With Notes and Memoir. *Second Edition.* 8vo. 16s.

MALCOLM'S (Sir JOHN) Sketches of Persia. *Third Edition.*
Post 8vo. 5s.

MANTELL'S (GIDEON A.) Thoughts on Animalcules; or, the
Invisible World, as revealed by the Microscope. *Second Edition.* Plates.
16mo. 6s.

MANUAL OF SCIENTIFIC ENQUIRY, Prepared for the Use of
Officers and Travellers in general. By various Writers. Edited by Sir
J. HENSCHKE, Bart. *Second Edition.* Maps. Post 8vo. 10s. 6d. (*Pub-*
lished by order of the Lords of the Admiralty.)

MARKHAM'S (Mrs.) History of England. From the First Inva-
sion by the Romans, down to the fourteenth year of Queen Victoria's
Reign. *68th Edition.* Woodcuts. 12mo. 6s.

— **History of France. From the Conquest by the Gauls,**
to the Death of Louis Philippe. *30th Edition.* Woodcuts. 12mo. 6s.

MARKHAM'S History of Germany. From the Invasion by Marius, to the present time. 6th Edition. Woodcuts. 12mo. 6s.

—— History of Greece. With Chapters on the Literature, Art, and Domestic Manners of the Greeks. By Dr. WM. SMITH. 6th Edition. Woodcuts. 12mo. 7s. 6d.

—— History of Rome from the Earliest Times to the Establishment of the Empire. By H. G. LIDDELL, M.A. Woodcuts. 12mo. 7s. 6d.

—— Sermons for Children. Second Edition. Fcap. 8vo. 3s.

MARKLAND'S (J. H.) Remarks on English Churches, and Sepulchral Memorials. Fourth Edition. Woodcuts. Fcap. 8vo. 6s. 6d.

—— Reverence due to Holy Places. Third Edition. Fcap. 8vo. 2s.

MARRYAT'S (JOSEPH) History of Pottery and Porcelain, in the 15th, 16th, 17th, and 18th Centuries. With a Description of the Manufacture, a Glossary, and a List of Monograms. With Coloured Plates and Woodcuts. 8vo. 31s. 6d.

*. A few copies on India Proofs, mounted on Large Paper. 4to. 5l. 5s.

MATTHIÆ'S (AUGUSTUS) Greek Grammar for Schools. Abridged from the Larger Grammar. By Blomfield. 8th Edition. Revised by EDWARDS. 12mo. 3s.

—— Greek Accidence for Schools. Abridged by BLOMFIELD. Fourth Edition, revised by EDWARDS. 12mo. 2s.

MAUREL'S (JULES) Essay on the Character, Actions, and Writings of the Duke of Wellington. Second Edition. Fcap. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

MAWE'S (H. L.) Journal of a Passage from the Pacific to the Atlantic, crossing the Andes in the Northern Provinces of Peru, and descending the great River Marañon. 8vo. 12s.

MAXIMS AND HINTS for an Angler, and the Miseries of Fishing. By RICHARD PENN. Second Edition. Woodcuts. 12mo. 5s.

MAYO'S (DR.) Pathology of the Human Mind. Fcap. 8vo. 5s. 6d.

MELVILLE'S (HERMANN) Typee and Omoo; or, Adventures amongst the Marquesas and South Seas. 2 Vols. Post 8vo. 10s.

MENDELSSOHN'S (FELIX BARTHOLODY) Life. By JULES BENEDICT. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

MERRIFIELD (MRS.) on the Arts of Painting in Oil, Miniature, Mosaic, and Glass; Gilding, Dyeing, and the Preparation of Colours and Artificial Gems, described in several old Manuscripts. 2 Vols. 8vo. 30s.

MEREDITH'S (MRS. CHARLES) Notes and Sketches of New South Wales, during a Residence from 1839 to 1844. Post 8vo. 2s. 6d.

—— Tasmania, during a Residence of Nine Years. With Illustrations. 2 Vols. Post 8vo. 18s.

MILFORD'S (JOHN) Norway and her Laplanders in 1841; with a Few Hints to the Salmon Fisher. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

MITCHELL'S (THOMAS) Plays of Aristophanes. With English Notes. 8vo.—1. CLOUDS, 10s.—2. WASPS, 10s.—3. FROGS, 15s.

MODERN DOMESTIC COOKERY. Founded on Principles of Economy and Practical Knowledge, and adapted for Private Families. New and Cheaper Edition. Woodcuts. Fcap. 8vo. 6s.

MILMAN'S (DEAN) History of Christianity, from the Birth of Christ to the Extinction of Paganism in the Roman Empire. 3 Vols. 8vo. 36s.

— History of Latin Christianity; including that of the Popes to the Pontificate of Nicholas V. 6 Vols. 8vo. Vols. I. to III. 36s.

— Character and Conduct of the Apostles considered as an Evidence of Christianity. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

— Life and Correspondence of Edward Gibbon. Portrait. 8vo. 9s.

— Life and Works of Horace. With 300 Woodcuts. *New Edition.* 2 Vols. Crown 8vo. 30s.

— Poetical Works. Plates. 3 Vols. Fcap. 8vo. 18s.

— Fall of Jerusalem. Fcap. 8vo. 1s.

MILMAN'S (CAPT. E. A.) Wayside Cross; or, the Raid of Gomez. A Tale of the Carlist War. Post 8vo. 2s. 6d.

MONASTERY AND THE MOUNTAIN CHURCH. By Author of "Sunlight through the Mist." Woodcuts. 16mo. 4s.

MOLTKE'S (BARON) Russian Campaigns on the Danube and the Passage of the Balkan, 1828—9. Plans. 8vo. 14s.

MOORE'S (THOMAS) Life and Letters of Lord Byron. Plates. 6 Vols. Fcap. 8vo. 18s.; or, One Volume. Royal 8vo. 12s.

MUCK MANUAL (The) for the Use of Farmers. A Practical Treatise on the Chemical Properties, Management, and Application of Manures. By FREDERICK FALKNER. *Second Edition.* Fcap. 8vo. 6s.

MUNDY'S (CAPT. RODNEY) Events in Borneo, including the Occupation of Labuan and Visit to the Celebes. Plates. 2 Vols. 8vo. 32s.

MUNRO'S (GENERAL SIR THOMAS) Life and Letters. By the REV. G. R. GLEIG. Post 8vo. 5s.

MURCHISON'S (SIR RODERICK) Russia in Europe and the Ural Mountains; Geologically Illustrated. With Coloured Maps, Plates, Sections, &c. 2 Vols. Royal 4to. 8l. 8s.

— Siluria; or, a History of the Oldest Rocks containing Organic Remains. With Map and Plates. 8vo. 30s.

MURRAY'S (CAPT. A.) Naval Life and Services of Admiral Sir Philip Durham. 8vo. 5s. 6d.

MURRAY'S RAILWAY READING. Published occasionally; varying in size and price, and suited for all classes of Readers.

[The following are published:]

WELLINGTON. By LORD ELLENBOROUGH. 6d.
NIMROD OF THE CHASE. 1s.
ESSAYS FROM "THE TIMES." 2 Vols. 8s.
MUSIC AND DRESS. 1s.
LATARD'S POPULAR ACCOUNT OF NINEVEH. 5s.
MILMAN'S FALL OF JERUSALEM. 1s.
MAHON'S "FORTY-FIVE." 3s.
LIFE OF THEODORE HOOD. 1s.
DEEDS OF NAVAL DARING. 2 Vols. 5s.
THE HONEY BEE. 1s.
JAMES' AEsOP'S FABLES. 2s. 6d.
NIMROD ON THE TURF. 1s. 6d.
OLIPHANT'S NEFAUL. 2s. 6d.
ART OF DINING. 1s. 6d.

HALLAN'S LITERARY ESSAYS. 2s.
MAHON'S JOAN OF ARC. 1s.
HRAV'S EMIGRANT. 2s. 6d.
NIMROD ON THE ROAD. 1s.
NIRKINSON'S ANCIENT EGYPTIANS. 12s.
CAOBER ON THE GUILLOTINE. 1s.
HOLLWAY'S NORWAY. 2s.
MAUREL'S WELLINGTON. 1s. 6d.
CAMPELL'S LIFE OF BACON. 2s.
THE FLOWER GARDEN. 1s.
LOCKHART'S SPANISH BALLADS. 2s. 6d.
LUCAS ON HISPORT. 6d.
BRAUTER OF BREGON. 3s.
TAYLOR'S NOTES FROM LIFE. 2s.
REJECTED ADDRESSES. 1s.

- MUSIC AND DRESS. Two Essays by a Lady. Reprinted from the "Quarterly Review." Fcap. 8vo. 1s.
- NAUTICAL ALMANACK (The). (*Published by Order of the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty.*) Royal 8vo. 2s. 6d.
- NAVY LIST (The Royal). (*Published Quarterly, by Authority.*) 12mo. 2s. 6d.
- NEWBOLD'S (LIEUT.) Straits of Malacca, Penang, and Singapore. 2 Vols. 8vo. 26s.
- NICHOLLS' (SIR GEORGE) History of the English Poor Law : in connection with the Condition of the People. 2 Vols. 8vo. 23s.
- NIMROD On the Chace—The Turf—and The Road. Reprinted from the "Quarterly Review." Woodcuts. Fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.
- NORTON'S (HON. CAROLINE) Letters from Sierra Leone, to Friends at Home. By a LADY. Edited by Mrs. NORTON. Post 8vo. 5s.
- O'BYRNE'S (W. R.) Naval Biographical Dictionary, comprising the Life and Services of every Living Officer in H. M. Navy, from the Rank of Admiral to that of Lieutenant. Compiled from Authentic and Family Documents. Royal 8vo. 42s.
- O'CONNOR'S (R.) Field Sports of France ; or, Hunting, Shooting, and Fishing on the Continent. Woodcuts. 12mo. 7s. 6d.
- OLIPHANT'S (LAURENCE) Journey to Katmandu, with Visit to the Camp of the Nepalese Ambassador. Fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.
- OXENHAM'S (REV. W.) English Notes for Latin Elegiacs ; designed for early Proficients in the Art of Latin Versification, with Prefatory Rules of Composition in Elegiac Metre. *Second Edition.* 12mo. 4s.
- PAGET'S, (JOHN) Hungary and Transylvania. With Remarks on their Condition, Social, Political, and Economical. *Third and Cheaper Edition.* Woodcuts. 2 Vols. 8vo. 18s.
- PARISH'S (SIR WOODBINE) Buenos Ayres and the Provinces of the Rio de la Plata. Their First Discovery and Conquest, Present State, Trade, Debt, &c. *Second Edition.* Map and Woodcuts. 8vo. 15s.
- PARIS'S (T. C.) Letters from the Pyrenees during Three Months' Pedestrian Wanderings amidst the Wildest Scenes of the French and Spanish Pyrenees. Woodcuts. Post 8vo. 10s. 6d.
- PARKYNS' (MANSFIELD) Personal Narrative of Three Years' Residence and Adventures in Abyssinia. Woodcuts. 2 Vols. 8vo. 30s.
- PEILE'S (REV. DR.) Agamemnon of Æschylus. A New Edition of the Text, with Notes, Critical, Explanatory, and Philological, for the Use of Students. *Second Edition.* 8vo. 9s.
- Choephore of Æschylus. A New Edition of the Text, with Notes, Critical, Explanatory, and Philological, for the Use of Students. *Second Edition.* 8vo. 9s.
- PELLEW'S (DEAN OF NORWICH) Life of Lord Sidmouth, with his Correspondence. Portraits. 3 Vols. 8vo. 42s.
- PENN'S (RICHARD) Maxims and Hints for an Angler, and the Miseries of Fishing. To which is added, Maxims and Hints for a Chess-player. *Second Edition.* Woodcuts. Fcap. 8vo. 5s.
- (GRANVILLE) Bioscope ; or, Dial of Life Explained. To which is added, a Translation of St. Paulinus' Epistle to Celerantia, on the Rule of Christian Life ; and an Elementary View of General Chronology. *Second Edition.* With Dial Plate. 12mo. 12s.

PENROSE'S (REV. JOHN) Lives of Vice-Admiral Sir C. V. Penrose, and Captain James Trevenen. Portraits. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

— (F. C.) Principles of Athenian Architecture, and the Optical Refinements exhibited in the Construction of the Ancient Buildings at Athens, from a Survey. With 40 Plates. Folio. 5l. 5s. (*Published under the direction of the Dilettanti Society.*)

PERRY'S (SIR ERSKINE) Bird's-Eye View of India. With Extracts from a Journal kept in the Provinces, Nepal, &c. Fcap. 8vo.

PHILLIPS' (JOHN) Memoirs of William Smith, LL.D., (the Geologist). Portrait. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

— Geology of Yorkshire. The Yorkshire Coast, and the Mountain-Limestone District. Plates 4to. Part I., 3l. 6d.—Part II., 52s. 6d.

— The Rivers, Mountains, and Sea Coast of Yorkshire. With Essays on the Climate, Scenery, and Ancient Inhabitants of the Country. *Second Edition*, with 36 Plates. 8vo. 15s.

PHILOSOPHY IN SPORT MADE SCIENCE IN EARNEST; or, the First Principles of Natural Philosophy inculcated by aid of the Toys and Sports of Youth. *Seventh Edition*. Woodcuts. Fcap. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

PHILPOTTS (BISHOP) Letters to the late Charles Butler, on the Theological parts of his "Book of the Roman Catholic Church;" with Remarks on certain Works of Dr. Milner and Dr. Lingard, and on some parts of the Evidence of Dr. Doyle. *Second Edition*. 8vo. 16s.

PHIPPS' (HON. EDMUND) Memoir, Correspondence, Literary and Unpublished Diaries of Robert Plumer Ward. Portrait. 2 Vols. 8vo. 28s.

POOLE'S (R. S.) *Horæ Egyptiæ*: or, the Chronology of Ancient Egypt, discovered from Astronomical and Hieroglyphic Records upon its Monuments. Plates. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

— (REV. G. A.) Handbook for the Cathedrals of England. Containing Descriptions of each. Woodcuts. Post 8vo. *In Preparation*.

POPE'S (ALEXANDER) WORKS. An entirely New Edition. Edited by the Right Hon. JOHN WILSON CROKER assisted by PETER CUNNINGHAM, F.R.S.A. 8vo. *In the Press*.

PORTER'S (G. R.) Progress of the Nation, in its various Social and Economical Relations, from the beginning of the Nineteenth Century. *Third Edition*. 8vo. 24s.

— (MRS. G. R.) Rational Arithmetic for Schools and for Private Instruction. 12mo. 3s. 6d.

POWELL'S (REV. W. P.) Latin Grammar simplified. 12mo. 3s. 6d.

PRAYER-BOOK (THE), Illuminated with 1000 Illustrations of Borders, Initials, Vignettes, &c. Medium 8vo. Cloth, 21s.; Calf, 31s. 6d. Morocco, 42s.

PROGRESS OF RUSSIA IN THE EAST. An Historical Summary, continued to the Present Time. With Map by ARROWSMITH. *Third Edition*. 8vo. 6s. 6d.

QUARTERLY REVIEW (THE). 8vo. 6s.

RANKE'S (LEOPOLD) Political and Ecclesiastical History of the Popes of Rome, during the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. Translated from the German by MRS. AUSTIN. *Third Edition*. 2 Vols. 8vo. 24s.

- RAWLINSON'S (REV. GEORGE) Herodotus.** A New English Version. Translated from the Text of GAISFORD, and Edited with Notes, illustrating the History and Geography of Herodotus, from the most recent sources of information, embodying the chief Results, Historical and Ethnographical, which have been arrived at in the progress of Cuneiform and Hieroglyphical Discovery. Assisted by COLONEL RAWLINSON, and SIR J. G. WILKINSON. 4 Vols. 8vo. *In Preparation.*
- REJECTED ADDRESSES (THE).** By JAMES AND HORACE SMITH. With Biographies of the Authors, and additional Notes. *New Edition, with the Author's latest Corrections.* Portraits. Fcap. 8vo. 1s. or on *Fine Paper.* With Portrait and Woodcuts. Fcap. 8vo. 6s.
- RICARDO'S (DAVID) Political Works.** With a Notice of his Life and Writings. By J. R. McCULLOCH. *New Edition.* 8vo. 16s.
- RIPA'S (FATHER) Memoirs during Thirteen Years' Residence at the Court of Peking, in the Service of the Emperor of China.** Translated from the Italian. By FORTUNATO PRANDI. Post 8vo. 2s. 6d.
- ROBERTSON'S (REV. J. C.) History of the Christian Church, to the Pontificate of Gregory the Great: a Manual for general Readers as well as for Students in Theology.** 8vo. 12s.
- ROBINSON'S (EDWD., D.D.) Biblical Researches in the Holy Land.** A New and Revised Edition. With Maps. 2 Vols. 8vo. *In Preparation.*
- *Later Biblical Researches in the Holy Land in the year 1852.* Maps. 8vo. *In Preparation.*
- ROMILLY'S (SIR SAMUEL) Memoirs and Political Diary.** By his Sons. *Third Edition.* Portrait. 2 Vols. Fcap. 8vo. 12s.
- ROSS'S (SIR JAMES) Voyage of Discovery and Research in the Southern and Antarctic Regions during the years 1839-43.** Plates. 2 Vols. 8vo. 36s.
- ROYAL SOCIETY OF LITERATURE (THE). TRANSACTIONS.** Plates. Vols. I. to III. 8vo. 12s. each.
- RUNDELL'S (MRS.) Domestic Cookery, founded on Principles of Economy and Practice, and adapted for Private Families.** *New and Cheaper Edition.* Woodcuts. Fcap. 8vo. 5s.
- RUXTON'S (GEORGE F.) Travels in Mexico; with Adventures among the Wild Tribes and Animals of the Prairies and Rocky Mountains.** Post 8vo. 5s.
- SALE'S (LADY) Journal of the Disasters in Afghanistan.** *Eighth Edition.* Post 8vo. 12s.
- (SIR ROBERT) *Brigade in Afghanistan.* With an Account of the Seizure and Defence of Jellalabad. By REV. G. R. GLISIG. Post 8vo. 2s. 6d.
- SCROPE'S (WILLIAM) Days of Deer-Stalking in the Forest of Atholl; with some Account of the Nature and Habits of the Red Deer.** *Third Edition.* Woodcuts. Crown 8vo. 20s.
- *Days and Nights of Salmon Fishing in the Tweed; with a short Account of the Natural History and Habits of the Salmon.* *Second Edition.* Woodcuts. Royal 8vo.
- (G. P.) *Memoir of Lord Sydenham, and his Administration in Canada.* *Second Edition.* Portrait. 8vo. 9s. 6d.
- SENTENCES FROM THE PROVERBS.** In English, French, Italian, and German. For the Daily Use of Young Persons. By A LADY. 16mo. 3s. 6d.

- SEYMOUR'S (H. DANDY) Account of the Crimea and the Shores of the Sea of Azoff. Map. 8vo.
- SHAW'S (THOS. B.) Outlines of English Literature, for the Use of Young Students. Post 8vo. 12s.
- SIDMOUTH'S (LORD) Life and Correspondence. By the Hon. and Rev. GEORGE PELLEW, DEAN OF NORWICH. Portraits. 3 Vols. 8vo. 42s.
- SIERRA LEONE; Described in a Series of Letters to Friends at Home. By A LADY. Edited by MRS. NORTON. Post 8vo. 5s.
- SMITH'S (WM., LL.D.) Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities. *Second Edition.* With 500 Woodcuts. 8vo. 42s.
- Smaller Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities, *Third Edition.* With 200 Woodcuts. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.
- Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology. With 500 Woodcuts. 3 Vols. 8vo. 5l. 15s. 6d.
- Dictionary of Greek and Roman Geography. Woodcuts. Vol. I. 8vo. 36s.
- New Classical Dictionary for Schools. Compiled from the two last works. *Third Edition.* 8vo. 15s.
- Smaller Classical Dictionary. *Third Edition.* With 200 Woodcuts. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.
- New Latin-English Dictionary for Colleges and Schools. Medium 8vo.
- Smaller Latin-English Dictionary. Square 8vo. "
- School History of Greece; from the Earliest Times to the Roman Conquest, with Supplementary Chapters on the History of Literature and Art. Woodcuts. *Sixth Edition.* Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.
- School History of Rome; from the Earliest Times to the Establishment of the Empire. By H. G. LIDDELL, M.A., Head Master of Westminster School. Woodcuts. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d.
- Edition of Gibbon's Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire. With Notes by MILMAN and GUIZOT. Portrait and Map. 8 Vols. 8vo. 60s.
- (WM. JAS.) Grenville Letters and Diaries, including MR. GRENVILLE'S DIARY OF POLITICAL EVENTS, while First Lord of the Treasury. Edited with Notes. 4 Vols. 8vo. 61s.
- (JAMES & HORACE) Rejected Addresses. *Twenty-third Edition, with Author's latest corrections.* Fcap. 8vo. 1s., or on *Fine Paper.* With Portrait and Woodcuts. Fcap 8vo. 5s.
- SOMERVILLE'S (MARY) Physical Geography. *Third Edition.* Portrait. 2 Vols. Fcap. 8vo. 12s.
- Connexion of the Physical Sciences. *Eighth Edition.* Plates. Fcap. 8vo. 10s. 6d.
- SOUTHEY'S (ROBERT) Book of the Church; with Notes containing the Authorities, and an Index. *Sixth Edition.* 8vo. 12s.
- Lives of John Bunyan & Oliver Cromwell. Post 8vo. 2s. 6d.

- SPECKTER'S (OTTO)** Charmed Roe; or, the Story of the Little Brother and Sister. Illustrated. 16mo. 5s.
- STANLEY'S (EDWARD, D.D., Bp. of Norwich)** ADDRESSES AND CHARGES. With a Memoir of his Life. By His Son. *Second Edition.* 8vo. 10s. 6d.
- (ARTHUR P.) Commentary on St. Paul's Epistles to the Corinthians, with Notes and Dissertations. 2 Vols. 8vo. *In the Press.*
- Historical Memoirs of Canterbury. The Landing of Augustine—The Murder of Becket—The Black Prince—The Shrine of Becket. Woodcuts. 8vo. 7s. 6d.
- Sinai and Palestine. In Connexion with their History. Map. 8vo.
- ST. JOHN'S (CHARLES)** Field Notes of a Sportsman and Naturalist in Sutherland. Woodcuts. 2 Vols. Post 8vo. 18s.
- Wild Sports and Natural History of the Highlands. Post 8vo. 5s.
- (BAYLE) Adventures in the Libyan Desert and the Oasis of Jupiter Ammon. Woodcuts. Post 8vo. 2s. 6d.
- STISTED'S (MRS. HENRY)** Letters from the Bye-Ways of Italy. Plates. 8vo. 18s.
- STOTHARD'S (THOS., R. A.)** Life. With Personal Reminiscences. By Mrs. BRAY. With Portrait, and 60 Woodcuts. 4to. 21s.
- STRIFE FOR THE MASTERY.** Two Allegories. With Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 6s.
- SUNLIGHT THROUGH THE MIST;** or, Practical Lessons drawn from the Lives of Good Men, intended as a Sunday Book for Children. By A LADY. *Second Edition.* 16mo. 3s. 6d.
- SUTTON (HON. H. MANNERS).** Some Account of the Courts of London and Vienna, at the end of the Seventeenth Century, extracted from the Official and Private Correspondence of Robert Sutton (late Lord Lexington) while British Minister at Vienna, 1694-98. 8vo. 14s.
- SWIFT'S (JONATHAN)** Works. New Edition, based upon Sir Walter Scott's Edition, entirely revised. 8vo. *In Preparation.*
- SYDENHAM'S (LORD)** Memoirs. With his Administration in Canada. By G. POULET SCROPE, M.P. *Second Edition.* Portrait. 8vo. 9s. 6d.
- TALBOT'S (H. FOX)** English Etymologies. 8vo. 12s.
- TAYLOR'S (HENRY)** Notes from Life. Post 8vo. 6s.; or, *Cheap Edition.* Fcap. 8vo. 2s.
- Notes from Books. *Third Edition.* Post 8vo. 9s.
- (J. E.) Fairy Ring. A Collection of Stories for Young Persons. From the German. With Illustrations by RICHARD DOYLE. *Second Edition.* Woodcuts. Fcap. 8vo. 7s. 6d.
- TENNENT'S (SIR J. E.)** Christianity in Ceylon. Its Introduction and Progress under the Portuguese, Dutch, British, and American Missions. With an Historical Sketch of the Brahmanical and Buddhist Superstitions. Woodcuts. 8vo. 14s.

THREE-LEAVED MANUAL OF FAMILY PRAYER; arranged so as to save the trouble of turning the Pages backwards and forwards. Royal 8vo. 2s.

THRESHOLD (THE) OF LIFE. A Series of Letters addressed to a Son on his Entrance into the world. Fcap. 8vo. *In the Press.*

TICKNOR'S (GEORGE) History of Spanish Literature. With Criticisms on particular Works, and Biographical Notices of Prominent Writers. *Second and Cheaper Edition.* 3 Vols. 8vo. 24s.

TREMEEER'S (H. S.) Political Experience of the Ancients, in its bearing on Modern Times. Fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Notes on Public Subjects, made during a Tour in the United States and Canada. Post 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Constitution of the United States compared with our own. Post 8vo. 9s. 6d.

TURNBULL'S (P. E.) Narrative of Travels in Austria, with Remarks on its Social and Political Condition. 2 Vols. 8vo. 24s.

TWISS' (HORACE) Public and Private Life of Lord Chancellor Eldon, with Selections from his Correspondence. Portrait. *Third Edition.* 2 Vols. Post 8vo. 21s.

UBICINI'S (M. A.) Letters on Turkey and its Inhabitants—the Moslems, Greeks, Armenians, &c. 2 Vols. Post 8vo.

VAUGHAN'S (REV. DR.) Sermons preached in Harrow School. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Nine New Sermons. 12mo. 5s.

VAUX'S (W. S. W.) Handbook to the Antiquities in the British Museum; being a Description of the Remains of Greek, Assyrian, Egyptian, and Etruscan Art preserved there. With 300 Woodcuts. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d.

VOYAGE to the Mauritius and back, touching at the Cape of Good Hope, and St. Helena. By Author of "PADDIANA." Post 8vo. 9s. 6d.

WAAGEN'S (DR.) Treasures of Art in Great Britain. Being an Account of the Chief Collections of Paintings, Sculpture, Manuscripts, Miniatures, &c. &c., in this Country. Obtained from Personal Inspection during Visits to England. 3 Vols. 8vo. 36s.

WADDINGTON'S (DEAN) The Condition and Prospects of the Greek Church. *New Edition.* Fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

WAKEFIELD'S (E. J.) Adventures in New Zealand. With some Account of the Beginning of the British Colonisation of the Island. Map. 2 Vols. 8vo. 28s.

WALKS AND TALKS. A Story-book for Young Children. By AUNT IDA. With Woodcuts. 16mo. 5s.

WARD'S (ROBERT PLUMER) Memoir, Correspondence, Literary and Unpublished Diaries and Remains. By the Hon. EDMUND PHIPPS. Portrait. 2 Vols. 8vo. 28s.

WATT (JAMES); Origin and Progress of his Mechanical Inventions. Illustrated by his correspondence with his friends. Edited with an Introductory Memoir, by J. F. MURHEAD. Plates. 3 vols. 8vo., 45s.; or Large Paper. 4to. 48s.

WELLESLEY'S (REV. DR.) Anthologia Polyglotta; a Selection of Versions in various Languages chiefly from the Greek Anthology. 8vo, 15s.; or 4to, 42s.

32 LIST OF WORKS PUBLISHED BY MR. MURRAY.

WELLINGTON'S (THE DUKE OF) Character, Actions, and Writings.

By JULES MAUREL. *Second Edition.* 1s. 6d.

— Despatches during his various Campaigns.

Compiled from Official and other Authentic Documents. By COL. GUARWOOD, C.B. *New Enlarged Edition.* 8 Vols. 8vo. 21s. each.

— Selections from his Despatches and General Orders. 8vo. 18s.

— Speeches in Parliament. Collected and Arranged with his sanction. 2 Vols. 8vo. 42s.

WILKIE'S (SIR DAVID) Life, Journals, Tours, and Critical Remarks

on Works of Art, with a Selection from his Correspondence. By ALLAN CUNNINGHAM. Portrait. 3 Vols. 8vo. 42s.

WILKINSON'S (SIR J. G.) Popular Account of the Private Life,

Manners, and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians. With 500 Woodcuts. 2 Vols. Post 8vo. 12s.

— Dalmatin and Montenegro; with a Journey to Mostar in Herzegovina, and Remarks on the Slavonic Nations. Plates and Woodcuts. 2 Vols. 8vo. 42s.

— Handbook for Egypt.—Thebes, the Nile, Alexandria, Cairo, the Pyramids, Mount Sinai, &c. Map. Post 8vo. 16s.

— (MATTHEW, D.D.) School Sermons, preached in the Chapel of Marlborough College. 8vo. 9s.

— (G. B.) Working Man's Handbook to South Australia; with Advice to the Farmer, and Detailed Information for the several Classes of Labourers and Artisans. Map. 18mo. 1s. 6d.

WOOD'S (LIEUT.) Voyage up the Indus to the Source of the

River Oxus, by Kabul and Badakhshan. Map. 8vo. 14s.

WOODWARD'S (B.B.) Handbook of History; or Chronology

Alphabetically Arranged to Facilitate Reference. 8vo.

WORDSWORTH'S (REV. DR.) Athens and Attica. Journal of a

Tour. *Third Edition.* Plates. Post 8vo. 8s. 6d.

— King Edward VIth's Latin Grammar, for the Use of Schools. *10th Edition*, revised. 12mo. 3s. 6d.

— First Latin Book, or the Accidence, Syntax and Prosody, with English Translation for Junior Classes. *Second Edition.* 12mo. 2s.

WORNUM'S (RALPH) Biographical Dictionary of Italian Painters:

with a Table of the Contemporary Schools of Italy, designed as a Handbook to the Picture Galleries of Italy. By a LADY. With a Chart. Post 8vo. 6s. 6d.

WORSAAE'S (J. J. A.) Account of the Danes and Northmen in

England, Scotland, and Ireland. Woodcuts. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

YOUNG'S (DR. THOS.) (the Discoverer of Hieroglyphics) Life.

By GEORGE PEACOCK, D.D., Dean of Ely. Portrait. 8vo.

— Miscellaneous Works, edited, by DEAN PEACOCK and JOHN LEITCH. Plates and Woodcuts. 3 Vols. 8vo.